A NON EST INVENTUS Return'd to Mr. EDWARD BAGSHAW'S ENQUIRY, AND Vainly boasted Discovery Of weakness in the Grounds of the CHURCHES INFALLIBILITY. ALSO His Seditious INVECTIVES Against the Moderate Sincerity of PROTESTANTS, and savage Cruelty against ROMAN CATHOLICKS *Repressed*

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

By a Catholick Gentleman. Hugh P. de Cressy.

PSALM. LXIII. v. VI. *Scrutati sunt Iniquitates; defecerunt Scrutinio.*

They made an Enquiry after Iniquities; but the Enquirers failed in the Enquiry.

Printed in the Year, MDCLXII.

A

NONJURIST INVENTOS

Returned to

Mr. EDWARD BAGSHAW'S

NONJURIST,

AND

Vainly boasted Discovery

Of weaknesses in the grounds of the

CATHOLICKS

FUNDAMENTALITY.

ALSO

Some Seditious Invectives

Against the Moderate Sincerity of

PROTESTANTS, and Loyalty

Entirely asserted

ROMAN CATHOLICKS

Appellant.

By a Catholick Gentleman, [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

Mr. *Edward Bagſhaw*,

THe Title of your Book is not immodeſt, being called only *An Enquiry into the Grounds of the Roman Churches Infallibility*; But by pronouncing in the concluſion thoſe fatall words, *MENE TEKEL*, you confidently declare, it cannot be anſwered: The deſtruction of the *Babilonian Monarchy* was not more inevitable after the writing that *Decretory* ſentence by an inviſible Angels fingers, than is the *Roman Churches* now. You have compiled and publiſhed this your Book, which you judge unanſwerable, and (to deal ingenuouſly with you) ſo may I too, though I be as good a *Catholick* as the *Pope* himſelf. What would you have more? A reaſon for it? Have but a little patience and you ſhall not fail of one, better then you expect, or have knowledge to foreſee.

2. Yet I conceive it concerns not *Catholicks* only, but the whole Kingdom,

I mean *all good Subjects* in it, that ſuch a book, though pretendedly againſt Roman Catholicks only, yet full of pernicious invectives, malicious complaints, and ſeditious reflexions againſt the State, ſhould with a barefac'd impudence ſtalke abroad in the publick view, as fearleſs of a cenſure. Nor is the Book in it ſelf ſo highly provoking, as in reſpect of the abominable Preface that no honeſt ſubject, Proteſtant or Catholick, can read without indignation, no reader juſtify or not miſlike without declaring his Thirſt after the publick ruine.

3. The Apoſtles advice of *redeeming the time* forbids me to miſpend it by replying line after line to what you have written: That therefore which *I* have to ſay to you ſhall be to make good theſe poſitions in direct oppoſition to what
1. you have written, *viz.* 1. That it is againſt the welfare of Engliſh ſubjects, both for body and ſoul, that you, and ſuch as you ſhould be permitted to call your ſelves Proteſtants, and members of the Engliſh Church. 2. That your
2. inſtilling ſuſpicions into the peoples minds, as if Engliſh Divines, &c. had a deſign to introduce Popery again, is a meer acting over the late Rebellion.

3. That

3. That your attempt to render Roman Catholick ſubjects only in an incapacity of Toleration, is more groundleſſe, and in your mouthes moſt maliciouſly ridiculous. 4. That your whole diſcourſe againſt the *Churches Infallibility* only proves that you have nothing to ſay to the purpoſe againſt it. 3. 4.

I.

That it is a publick miſchief that Mr. Bagſhaw, *or any ſuch as he, ſhould be permitted to call themſelves Engliſh Proteſtants.*

1. IF common fame be true, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, you are the ſame perſon that publiſhed ſo petulant and uncivil a Libel againſt my Lord Biſhop of *Worceſter*, and not for that fault alone have been ſo deſervedly Diſciplined by Mr. *l'Eſtrange*, and ſo ſmartly whip't, that the whole Town has heard your cries. How then comes it to paſs that you can find leaſure to ſeek out, and defy to the combat other enemies? But it may be the demoliſhing of the Roman Church

is but an excurſion in a *Parentheſis*, whilſt you are, for your divertiſement, unbending your thoughts, or taking breath awhile againſt a new combat, with an Adverſary that has a great deal more zeal, ſharpneſs, honeſty and courage then is for your purpoſe, who hope not to be diſcern'd, whilſt in deſpight of *the Act of Oblivion* you will not ſuffer either the *King* or any of his faithfull *Subjects* to forget what they have ſuffered, and muſt expect, but ſtill work and preach and print, almoſt *totidem Verbis* as you did when the horrible Covenant was the only Religion and Goſpel of the three Kingdoms.

2. Theſe practices, Mr. *L'Eſtrange*, if he cannot interrupt, yet he can call company, and bid them take notice of them. He will not permit you to Glory as if you could once more couzen the Kingdom into a *new Rebellion*. Never hope to find ſo much as one *Engliſh Proteſtant* that will once more be cheated to look upon you as the *Aſſertors of the Subjects Liberties*, or maintainers of pure *Proteſtant Religion*. If the *Civil Authority* will for ever wink at your *Caballs*, and the *Eccleſiaſtick* leave open the *Pulpits* to your Sermons of the old ſtile

ſtile, and the *Preſſes* to your Pamphlets againſt *Biſhops* and indifferent *Ceremonies*: If you expect *Indemnity* muſt be interpreted to regard the future alſo, all that can be ſaid will be, *Sani, Sobrii, vigiles perimus.* We ſhall not, as heretofore, be ſurpriſed: but we *make a Covenant with deſtruction*, as if we were afraid it would eſcape us.

3. As for your *Pamphlet* touching *Infallibility*, though by the Title you pretend to attacque only *Roman Catholicks*, and to demoliſh the *Grounds of the Churches Faith*, yet in the whole *Book* there are not quite two ſmall leaves wherein the *Church* is concern'd at all either in its Grounds or Superſtructure. Therefore I am confident, and it may be *Mr. L'Eſtrange* (who knows your wayes and Arts much better then I) may in a far neater, that is, his own ſtile tell you, your real Deſign was to write a Book with the *Title* againſt *Catholicks*, meerly to have an opportunity to ſtuffe the *Preface* with malicious glances againſt Proteſtants too, and incenſe vulgar minds, as if *Popery* (forſooth) were ready to be introduced.

4. Now though my ſelf, purely as a *Catholick*, am little concern'd in that

part of your book which you purposely wrote against *Catholicks*; and not very much in those passages against *Protestants*, except only in this consideration, that you would fain make *Catholick Religion* your *Engine* to raise troubles, yet as a faithfull *Subject* to his *Majesty*, and a lover of my Countries peace, I cannot but inwardly bewail, and must take leave thus publickly to justifie the too reasonable cause of my grief, when I see an English Subject openly professing his name, and pretending to the Protection of an *Honourable Counsellour of State*, renew the old seditious practise of inflaming the Peoples minds with rage against their *Teachers*, and murmuring suspicions against their *Governours*: A practise that above all others contributed to the raising of the late *Rebellion*, and to the ruine and murder of our *late Soveraign of happy memory*, and his best Subjects and Servants, the late Archbishop of *Canterbury*, Earl of *Strafford*, &c. Here are still among us God knowes how many *Sects*, that if any *Protestant Doctours* shall presume to speak or write otherwise, then according to what the furious zeal of *Sectaries* against Ecclesiasti-

call

call Unity and peace ſuggeſts, they muſt preſently be expoſed to a general ſuſpicion, the Country muſt be raiſed upon them, and upon the Biſhops if they not *diſcountenance* them, and upon the *King* unleſs he puniſh them for no fault at all.

4. But give me leave now, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, to ask. *Who are you? of what Sect? Of what Church?* Common report gives you for a Presbyterian, a man formerly very buſie in the *Intrigues* of that *Faction*. Yet ſome paſſages in your *Preface* and *Epiſtle Dedicatory* ſpeak you an *Independent*: in which you call your ſelf *an Aſſertor of Chriſtian Liberty*, complaining of the *keenneſs of Laws againſt ſuch*; a diſliker of *Epiſcopal Authority as ſetled in* England; and one that *refuſes to admit the interpretation of Scripture from any Perſon or Church, but only from your own private Reaſon*. Moſt likely it is, you reſerve *in petto* a Declaration whether party you mean to adhere to, till you ſee how they are likely to thrive: till then you would paſs for an *Amphibion*. And truly ſuch a temper among you threatens much danger to the State. When *Pilate* and *Herod* are made friends, Chriſt muſt look to himſelf.

5. If you be an *Independent* on all o-

thers, will you not ſuffer others to be Independent likewiſe on you? Or if you be a *Presbyterian*; are you not content with enjoying hitherto the fruits of his *Majesties* moſt gracious promiſe from *Breda*? None pretend more then you to tender conſciences. Have any *call'd* you in *queſtion for differences in Religion?* But this it ſeems will not ſerve your turn: Nor an *Independents* turn. Your *tender conſcience* will not accept of the only condition that his *Majesty* annexes to this his *Grace*, which is, That you *muſt not diſturb the peace of the Kingdom.* This moſt *juſt* and *neceſſary condition* you here in your Preface renounce, in which you again blow the Trumpet to ſedition, by telling the World that Engliſh Divines are bringing in Popery. If that were true, as long as it may be permitted to you to be *Presbyterians* or *Independents* among your ſelves, what do you complain of? Will you never leave this peeviſh, this malicious envy, not to content your ſelves with your own ſafety unleſs others be ruin'd?

6. But it is intolerable that you ſhould call your ſelves in your Preface, *We Proteſtants:* and talke of *our Reformed*

formed Church of England, or *our Ancestors*, *Our primitive protestancy*, &c. Are you an English Protestant? a member of the English Church established by Law and Canons? Why then do you not submit peaceably to the government of your Bishops, and indifferent Ceremonies? Why do you reject the Book of Common Prayer enacted by supreme authority both Spiritual and Temporal to be the publick Liturgy of the protestancy of *England*? Why do you find fault with the keenness of Laws against such Assertors of Christian Liberty? The very titles you assume of Presbyterian or Independent, declare that your formal essence consists in an opposition to English protestancy and prelacy. You pilfer therefore the name of an English Protestant, *ut sportulam furunculus*, to use *Tertullians* phrase: Or rather you are English protestants, as *Salvian* says some in his time were Christians, *in opprobium & contumeliam Christi*.

7. But you are wise in your generations: you know you could do no mischief, unless you took a vizard. For if you had spoken in your Preface the true Language of a Sectary; if directing your speech to *English Protestants* you had said,

I Mr. Edward Bagſhaw, *Student of* Chriſt-Church, *a very Presbyterian* (*or Independent*) *a profeſſed Rebell againſt the Engliſh Church, do out of my tender love and care of the welfare and promotion of the ſaid Church, give you, O Engliſh Proteſtants, warning to take heed of Popery, for the bringing in of which among you Doctour* Gunning *and* Mr. Thorndike, *and God knowes how many more are preparing way; the Biſhops are of intelligence with them, and the State connives at them: Therefore look to your ſelves. All we can do is to blow the Trumpet, and tell you once more how courageouſly we will lead you to a thorough Reformation: If you have neither zeal for God, nor knowledge of your own ſtrength, 'tis none of our fault, Little do you know that we Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptiſts Quakers, &c. are again become good friends, and will joyne together to put down this Antichriſtian Hierarchy; and when we are to divide their lands it will be time to try which of us can get moſt. Now a beater Meane*

we

we have not for ſuch a purpoſe then, as formerly we did, to cry out, Beware of Popery, Take heed of your Antichriſtian Clergy, &c.

8. If you had unwiſely diſcovered your thoughts with ſuch plainneſſe, your open dealing would have ſhewed ſome ſincerity, ſome appearance of the ſimplicity of the *Dove*, but little of the ſubtle wiſdom of the *Serpent*, a quality much more for your purpoſe. Notwithſtanding, your vizard being quite worne out, your calling your ſelves Engliſh Proteſtants will not have the effect it had in your former happy dayes twenty years ſince. Your Voice is too well known now not to be *Jacobs*, There is ſcarce an Engliſh ſubject ſo ignorant, or of ſo ſhort a memory, but can take notice that this was the *Old Tune that ſounded to a charge*, and invited them to kill one another for Charities ſake, and to ſuffer you know whom, to murther the beſt King that ever reigned before him. The difference between the two Brethren in iniquity, being only this; One did but fight againſt him, and the Other killed him; One bound his hand, and the other cut off his head: They will

be

be ſo far from ſtartling at the name of Popery out of your mouthes, that perhaps they may begin to entertain a better opinion of a Religion ſo perſecuted by you, eſpecially remembring that the Papiſts never ſeparated their intereſts from the Kings and Theirs, but unanimouſly ventured their lives and eſtates for them, and this purely out of love, Duty and conſcience, even when all they could expect by a victory was to remain ſtill under the penalty of the Laws.

9. Therefore a diſguiſe is neceſſary for you whenſoever you would ſpeak, except to your own Party in private. It had been folly in extremity to ſay, *We Presbyterians, Independents, &c. do give you Engliſh Proteſtants warning to beware of your Doctours that would bring in Popery,* It had been apparently to your own prejudice, unleſs you had ſaid, *We tell you this who are true Reformed Engliſh Proteſtants, of the ſame Church with you, your Paſtours, who have care of your ſouls, whom you ſee no man hinders from preaching in your Pulpits, and writing Books to Preach to thoſe that cannot hear us in Pulpits. If we were enemies would the Civill or Eccleſiaſtical State, think you, allow us ſuch a liberty, and maintain us at their charges to Preach and Print as we do?* 10. But

10. But I do assure you Mr. *Bagshaw*, you are no English Protestant, For *what is it to be an English Protestant*, or *a member of the English Church*? This is a question of greater moment then ordinarily is believed: The very subsistence of Protestant Religion in *England* now depends upon the right stating of it. Nay I may truly say, that even we Roman Catholicks are much concerned in it, and therefore I may be pardoned if I insist upon it; because unless this question be resolved, all our disputes with Protestants are likely to prove meer beating of the air, contentions utterly wandring from the purpose. Therefore I may be excused, if I take the trouble upon me to resolve it: and this I must do, not upon *Catholick* grounds, or notions of the phrase [*being members of a Church*] but only the notions which Protestants and generally all *Sects* divided from the Catholicks have entertained of that phrase. For Catholicks do not esteem any one a member of the Roman Catholick Church, that doth not profess all Doctrines without exception taught by it to be true, and submits not to all the Lawes and Ordinances of it. There is no distinction to be made, as to this matter,

matter, between Doctrines in themselves Frndamental or non-Fundamental, between Lawes in themselves necessary or not: because a refusal to accept any one of those Lawes or Doctrines does vertually destroy the Authority of the Church, of how little concernment so ever such a Doctrine or Ordinance be in it self. There may be differences and even dissentions among Catholicks, about points of far greater moment in themselves, and yet neither of the parties be in danger of being excluded from the Title of Catholiks, or members of the Roman Catholick Church, because the Churches Authority has not interposed it self in those disputes either way, and therefore is untouched by either.

11. But generally all Congregations divided from the Catholick have a quite different conceit of the Phrase [*being Members of a Church*:] And this conceit is either general, or more special. According to the general conception of that phrase they acknowledge all to be members of their Church (or rather co-members of the Church of Christ) that do not teach doctrines or make ordinances excluding all right and interest

in

in the common ſalvation: and thus Engliſh proteſtants eſteem themſelves members of the Catholick Church, and *Lutherans* of the *Calviniſts* Church, and you Presbyterians, Independents, &c. of the Engliſh proteſtant Church: becauſe they do not deny a poſſibility of ſalvation to one another notwithſtanding the differences among them.

12. The ſecond and more ſpecial notion of the phraſe [*being Members of a Church*] entertained by all particular Congregations not Catholick, does import an external conformity in all Doctrines without exception, and all practiſes determined by each congregation reſpectively, a renunciation of any excluding the refuſers from an external communion and participation of the priviledges of that Congregation, who notwithſtanding may be acknowledged to be almoſt in as good a condition as to ſalvation, as thoſe are which exclude them from their external Communion. Thus *Lutherans* are not *Calviniſts*, though they believe *Calviniſts* may meet them in heaven, becauſe they will not admit them to their communion. Thus you Presbyterians and Independents, &c. are no Engliſh proteſtants as long

long as you are Non-Conformists. Let the differences between you be never so small [as wearing a Surplice, Kneeling at Communion, &c.] if these Ceremonies be established by Lawes Ecclesiastical or Civil, the non-submission to them is a manifest dividing from that Church: and the less considerable the quarrels are, the greater is the guilt of those that publickly dispute or write against that Church of which they desire to be thought members. True it is you would seem to have some reason to complain against the English Church, if for such trifling differencies only, they should pronounce you excommunicated from Christs Mystical Body: (though they must give me leave to say, That by not doing so, but acknowledging your Congregations to be members of the Church, they do manifestly conclude themselves guilty of Schisme by such a communication with you, whom they cannot deny to be Schismaticks:) But it would be ridiculous in you to accuse them of Tyranny for excluding you from their External Communion, when you your selves will not embrace it. They do not pretend to an Authority to oblige you in conscience to believe

believe that their Doctrines are true and their Ordinances just: but they would be no Church, they would renounce all Order, if they did not maintain the laws and customes with so great deliberation, and after so many disputes with you, framed and renewed. Where there is no Uniformity even in external matters, there is no Church, but a *Babel.* If at Communion some should sit, others stand, others lye along, (as our Lord did) and others kneel, if some should be bare-headed, others with their hats on, would it looke like an assembly of men that served God? Therefore complain not, but rather thank God and them, if they force not your consciences, but permit you to abstain from things you do not like, and to practice among your selves things you like better. But to expect to be acknowledged members of a Church, whilst you refuse to submit to the authority of that Church in things of themselves not evil, much more whilst you write publickly against them, is to desire them not to pretend to the name of a Church. Therefore, I conclude, that *you Mr.* Bagshaw *are no more a member of the English Church, then I am*: and my proofe is this very *Preface* of your

Book that I now write againſt. Your ſaying that Epiſcopacy is lawful, or your being ordained by Biſhops, ſignifies nothing; as long as you diſobey them, you are none of their ſubjects.

13. However I cannot blame you, if in deſpight of Engliſh proteſtants themſelves you will needs be called *Engliſh proteſtants*. For if being, as really you are, no true members of the Engliſh Church, you were treated as ſuch, that is, excluded from a participation of the emoluments of it, and obliged to a ſeparated exerciſe of your ill-natur'd Religion, two great incommodities would enſue to you, and withal two as proportionably great benefits to them, and the whole Nation.

14. For *Firſt*, What pittiful Congregations would you in a ſhort time appear to be? At preſent your numbers, eſpecially in Cities and Towns are not unconſiderable. Whereas, if being no members of the Engliſh Church, you were excluded from participating Tithes, Benefices and other preferments, not at all due to you, and had no other maintenance but the Voluntary contributions of your own party, you would quickly find that Party weary of you; and become

become rather content to hear a ſermon in the Church, and wholeſome prayers in a Surplice, then to pay ſo much overplus for far worſe ſtuffe in a parlour, from a ſhort cloak and no caſſack.

15. The *Second Mortification* thence flowing would be yet more intolerable. Hitherto the facility of Biſhops giving you leave to call your ſelves Engliſh proteſtants and members of their Church enables you to defile their Churches by doing your own buſineſſe in them to their great prejudice and danger. In their pulpits you cry down Ceremonies, you preach againſt their government, you ſow ſedition in the hearts of their flock, you inſtill diſcontent againſt the State: In a word you do all the miſchief you can, both to it and them. And all this while you enjoy their Livings: they maintain you to deſtroy them. Whereas if at the charges of your own patrons only you were to preach and pray in private parlours, your peculiar Gifts in both would quickly vaniſh: for there would be no uſe of rayling, and blowing up diſcontented paſſions in an Auditory, where moſt of your hearers can raile as well as your ſelves, and are perhaps already more diſcontented: You would loſe

the pleasure of gaining *Proselytes* to your Faction; because none will hear you that are in danger of being seduced. On the contrary to your hearts torment you would see even City-Churches every day more and more filled with your deareſt friends; nay your own Stomacks would come down, and for preferment, yea even bread, you would quickly digeſt both Croſſe and Surplice.

16. Before I leave this Argument, I would fain with your permiſſion propoſe a Queſtion to You, though I fear the very propoſal will anger You, and I do ſcarce hope for an Anſwer, though if you had a mind to it, nothing is more eaſie to be anſwered: and in caſe you reply to this paper, remember, I ſummon You not to forget this queſtion.

17. Suppoſe then *His Majeſty* and the *Parliament* ſhould by Law confirme to You the gratious promiſe from *Breda*, 'That upon giving ſecurity not to enter 'into practiſes to diſturbe the publick 'peace, You ſhould not be called in 'queſtion for matters of opinion, but 'ſhould have a moderate liberty to ex-'erciſe your Religion at home (or even in Churches to your own party only, with

with prohibition to all good ſubjects to come to your ſermons) 'would you be 'content with ſuch an indulgence and 'mercie from the State? Would You 'upon theſe termes engage to diſconti-'nue your ſermons and prayers top-ful of 'the *fel draconum*?

18. Till You anſwer this Queſtion, I will tell You the Opinion of many that believe they know Your temper well enough. They do aſſure themſelves you would not: You, I mean, Presbyterians and Independents: For as for your natural brood, and ſubdivided Sects of Anabaptiſts, Quakers, &c. I conceive they are more reaſonable in this matter of Liberty of conſcience. They would be content to ſerve God after their faſhion in their own Chambers, and would maintain their own Miniſters, and poor too, paying withall the dues which by Law belong to Pariſhes. Whereas there is but too good ground to believe that there is nothing more apprehended by You Presbyterians and Independents, then ſuch an indulgence: becauſe that would diſunite from you all other Sects, and make them ſure to the State againſt You: ſo that You and your Friends would ſtand miſerably and contemptibly alone.

19. True

19. True it is, you would fain ſeem ſomwhat inclined to a *Conformity* of your faſhion, and for that end You demand Conferences and Treaties with the Biſhops, &c. But withall You require a condeſcendence from them in ſuch things, as both honour and truth forbid a compliance in, and which cannot be granted without a ſecret acknowledgment that they have been faulty hitherto in oppreſſing You with undue burdens. And as for other trifling ſcruples of yours, You are more troubled when they yield any thing, then when they refuſe all. However by ſuch Treaties You gain this, that among Vulgar minds You may ſometimes paſs for zealous perſons in all things pertaining to God, and withall no enemies to peace: And beſides; You may have occaſion thereby to complain yet more againſt Biſhops, for not ſubmitting to your conditions, ſo eaſie and reaſonable. For alas! You deſire eaſe only in indifferent trifling matters: whereas in all neceſſary Ordinances for Gods glory You are ready to comply. What a great matter, ſay You, is a Surplice, or refuſing a Papiſtical Croſs? For peace ſake You will even digeſt Epiſcopacy. Let there be

Biſhops,

Biſhops, but not *jure Divino*, or if *jure Divino*, not ſuch as Law hath eſtabliſhed. Let them be countermanded each Biſhop by a dozen Presbyters, and ſubject to their Claſſes, and you will not ſtand upon the Title.

20. I dare ſay, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, You are very angrie now to be told thus publickly, *that you are more afraid of Liberty of Conſcience then of perſecution*, unleſs You might have leave to interpret *Liberty of conſcience*, to be a free permiſſion to do miſchief, not to ſerve God. And much more, to be told, You are no Engliſh proteſtant. But You muſt pardon us, that cannot but think ſo, till You tell the World what You mean by an Engliſh proteſtant, and what that Engliſh proteſtancy is which You profeſſe and maintaine, and have been ſo buſie Twenty Years, almoſt to the ruine of the Kingdome, to ſet up againſt *Prelacy*.

II.

That Mr. Bagſhaw's *inſtilling ſuſpicions into the Peoples minds, as if Engliſh Divines, &c. had a deſigne to introduce Popery again, is a mere acting over the late Rebellion.*

1. IT is now time to take into conſideration the zeal, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, that You, as a good Engliſh Proteſtant, have ſhew'd againſt thoſe that have a liking to the *pompe of popery*, and are ſo hardy as to make ſome attempts to bring it back into your Church. In this zeal You ſpare neither *Gentry* (including I ſuppoſe the *Nobility*) nor *Clergy*.

2. Firſt as touching the *Gentry*, You tell the Kingdom that *too many of our unwary Gentry begin already to be taken with the outward pompe of popery*. Who are theſe many, *too many?* They are Gentlemen. The Gentry indeed are not ſo apt to be wrought upon by You, as Inferiour *Tradesmen* and *day-labourers*: and therfore it is much for your purpoſe, that the general rout ſhould have a ſuſ-

Preface.

picion

picion of them. Well though there be *many* of them, yet You name none: whereas there are but two of the *Clergy*, and You name them both. There is some *Mystery* in this. Would You not have it believed, but dare not speak out, that these *too many Gentlemen* are some members of the present Parliament, that you covertly desire the Kingdome may suspect, and have an ill opinion of, because they will not, in compliance with your lovenly devotion, suffer you to burne Surplices and Copes, or abrogate decent Ceremonies? but much more because several Honourable persons among them have expressed some pity to Roman Catholicks, and an inclination to requite their fidelity with some small ease from the heavy burdens laid on them by the Lawes? It is a greater torment to You to see their Fidelity rewarded, then their Religion not persecuted. But it is intolerable to you, that no good Christian now can be unsatisfied in the way that Roman Catholicks have taken to appear fit objects of mercy, since they have both publickly in the house of Lords *Vivâ voce*, and by many Treatises and Protestations in writing given such security of their unalterable

rable *Loyalty* and Obedience to his Majestie, and the State, as not any Christian can possibly give greater, and I much fear You will never have the honesty to imitate them.

3. Observe one thing I pray You, in such Protestations and writings of Roman Catholicks. They do not deprecate any former faults committed, because they are guiltie of none: they protest their clearness from those crimes of *a few desperate unhappy monsters*, and writings of their traiterous Masters, that occasioned the severity of Laws against all: They do not mention their universal fidelitie to the King these last twentie Years, as an obligation or merit, for which they expect reward from men: but as a *necessary duty* to which their Religion bound them, and which if they had not performed, they should have incurred a curse from God. Yet all this perhaps will not satisfie You. But see our different Complexion: for my part though there were not one of Your (supposed) Religion, but were deeply ingaged in infidelity to the King, yet if You would only acknowledg that a fault was committed, is repented of, and a promise made of Loyalty for the future,

ture, I ſhould hope well, and wiſh You might be believed and confided in for the future.

4. Next as to the *Clergy*, Your accuſation is moſt heavy and punctual when You ſay, 'I need not plead for the not 'perſecuting of Poperie, &c. when ſome 'that yet profeſſe themſelves to be of 'our Church, and thoſe of good note 'too, are not afraid to plead for ſomthing 'more then its Toleration. Since by 'telling us in print, that the Pope is not 'Antichriſt, That Papiſts are not Idola-'ters; nay by affirming, That all are 'ſchiſmaticks who upon that ſcore do 'refuſe communion with them, they 'not only blemiſh the vertue and piety 'of our firſt Reformers, who all built 'upon that foundation, but likewiſe ſhew 'how willing they are upon any termes 'how wretched and unworthie ſoever, 'to returne into *Egypt*, and bring us to 'our Brick and bondage again. If this 'be not the intereſt of ſome, I cannot 'imagine what means the crying up of 'that Great *Diana* of the Papiſts, the '*Churches Authority*, and making that 'the ſole Interpreter of Scripture, The 'preaching up of *Lent*, and other poli-'tical Fiſh-daies, as Religious Faſts, and of

Preface.

Maſter Thorndike in Weights and Meaſures.

Dr. Gunning upon Math. 9.

M. Thorndike ut supra.

'of Apoſtolical Inſtitution, quite contrary both to expreſs ſcripture, and an 'Act of Parliament. The inſinuating, 'that we may lawfully pray for the dead, 'and likewiſe expect ſome benefit by 'their prayers, which in time may eaſily 'be improved to our praying unto them. 'Theſe with ſome other opinions of the 'like nature, ſo far degenerating from 'our primitive proteſtancy, do ſhew 'that if the Age is willing to be de-'ceived, there are not wanting learn-'ed men who are willing enough to de-'ceive them.

5. This *authority* that You, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, take upon You to proſcribe all proteſtants that dare not profeſs ſuch a deteſtation of *Catholick Unity* as Your *party* does, is alone ſufficient to demonſtrate how much the *Engliſh Clergy* does neglect their own preſervation, whilſt they permit ſuch as You to call your ſelves proteſtants, and *members of their Church*: your waies and intereſts being ſo directry oppoſed to theirs.

Archbiſhop of Canterbury.

6. *All England* almoſt has lately heard laid to the charge of the late moſt unjuſtly murdered Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, as the moſt heavy point of his accuſation, *that he had a deſire of reſtoring England*

England to Catholick unity. Yet there was not produced any proof at all, that for that end he deſerted any neceſſarie and eſſential Doctrines of his own Church: the mere deſire of *unity* was his crime. A crime that he willingly acknowledged, and as he had reaſon joyfullie boaſted of. And certainly, that Chriſtian muſt needs be full of a *Spirit not from heaven*, that hates unitie, *quatenus ipſam.* Now, what my Lord Archbiſhop deſired, and died for, I am perſwaded there is ſcarce any *true genuine Engliſh proteſtant* but does commend in him, and would not refuſe, occaſion being given, to imitate him in.

7. If you read Biſhop *Andrews* his works both Engliſh and Latine, You will, even in his *Controverſies* againſt Catholicks, find a wonderful caution not to aggravate, or multiply differences, great care to prevent miſ-intelligence, and an exactneſs in ſtating diſputed points with a moſt ſtudied impartiality, & very oft with condeſcendence. Nay even in his ſermons before the Court, in which his heart only ſpoke as as an Embaſſadour for God, what pangs may one perceive in his ſoul when he ſpeaks

Biſhop Andrews

upon this ſubject, and reflects on the averſion that ſome who like You, call themſelves proteſtants, have from Catholick peace and Unitie. Hearken to this one paſſage in his firſt Sermon on *Pentecoſt*: *Who ſhall make us of one accord? High ſhall his reward be in heaven, and happy his remembrance on earth, that ſhall be the means to reſtore this accord to the Church; that once we may keep a true and perfect Pentecoſt, like this here*, Erant omnes unanimiter. It was a reſtoring of unity that he ſo much thirſted after: which word ſhewes, that he had a reſpect to the Catholick Church from which only a ſeparation was made.

Doctour Steward.

8. And Doctour *Steward* likewiſe, a perſon as repleniſhed with learning, prudence and vertue as any of his time, he ſo longed after this unitie, that in his laſt Will he gave order it ſhould be the argument of the Inſcription on his Tombe. And no doubt there is, but ſuch an Inſcription would make it lighter, that is, render his future condition better.

9. Theſe wothy perſons were indeed Engliſh proteſtants, like thoſe You now arraign. They knew the true compoſition of their own Chuch: A Church, though

though I muſt needs ſay, not firmly built yet however erected by advice of perſons in *Authority*, perſons of honour and judgment: not as *Geneva*, *Holland*, and *Cromwels Independent Church*, by a rebellious Army of Tradesmen. They knew that at the firſt framing of the Engliſh Church a way was not ſo wholly given to paſſion, but that when certain intereſts of a few great perſons were complied with, and ſeveral too juſtly complained of *Gravamina* from the Roman Court remedied, there might be a poſſibility of cloſing again with that Church which they then only ſo far deſerted. They knew there was never any intention ſo to forſake the Roman Church, as if it were a *Babel*, or *ſeat of Antichriſt*, but ever acknowledged it a true Church, though not ſo well *Reformed*. On the contrarie *they knew*, and their *ſucceſſors* do ſtill to your hearts torment acknowledg, that all the *Ordination* and *ſpiritual Juriſdiction* of the Engliſh Church is derived from the Roman: which therefore muſt be a true *Church* if theirs be any.

10. Upon ſuch grounds as theſe, no queſtion, my Lord Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* not only deſired, as all honeſt well minded

minded Proteſtants do, but alſo hoped, that if by his *authority* and *skill* he could reduce the Engliſh church to that primitive State before your *Calviniſtical* dregs and poiſon were inſtilled into it, he might, upon warrantable terms, procure a *Re-union* with the Catholick Church. But how ſhould this Re-union be made? By giving up to Roman Catholicks' all the points of Engliſh Doctrine and Diſcipline? No ſuch matter. But this he knew, That in Books of Controverſy, among *ten Points* diſputed, there are not two wherein either of the Churches are intereſted: and that moſt of the few, real, Subſtantial differences might be qualified by a moderate interpretation and condeſcendence.

11. But whenſoever ſuch a buſineſs as this is either agitated or talked of, you Mr. *Bagſhaw* and your *party* ſmile, and deride us poor Roman Catholicks, as if we vainly framed to our ſelves great hopes and advantages by ſuch good Chriſtian deſignes, or Writings of Proteſtants. But truly you are deceived. We indeed, as we ought, are glad, purely for their ſakes that either deſigne or write ſincerely and ingenuouſly in matters of Religion. But ſuch deſigns and writings

Writings are harmeful to us in our present condition: and the reason is plain; because they being the works of particular persons without any publick commission; of persons that have no sufficient influence upon the whole English Church and State, they produce little effect: On the contrary they give only an opportunity to such malicious tongues and pens as Yours to Alarme the whole Kingdome both against them and us.

12. But if it would please his sacred Majestie or the Parliament to allow a modest Conference (not Dispute) between a certain number of sober learned English Protestants and Catholicks, by means of which a clear view might be given what the peculiar Doctrines by *Authority* established on both sides are, and what place may be allowed for moderate Interpretations and Condescensions, in all probability the success could not but be most happy: the whole Kingdome, yea all Christendom would stand in a maze to see what an inestimable blessing has been so long wanting to *England*, and how little cause there was it should be refused. How would the Civil and Ecclesiastical State of these nations be established and united in interests with all

the Christian world almost? How free should we all be from the least danger of being infected with the venom of Sectaries, and how secure from their designes? For then they would to all eyes appear in their distinct bodies: it would be seen who, how many, and how qualified they are: and permission being allowed them for a private liberty of exercising their Religions respectively, any succeeding tumults would be both easily repressed, and their cause appear inexcusable. In a word, Religion as it might by common Advice be setled in this Kingdom, would deserve to be the envy and pattern to all the world besides, being easily freed from many abuses much complained of, but hard to be rectified in other Catholick Countries.

13. And whence comes the obstruction to so inconceivable and universal a blessing as this, but meerly from such, English Protestants as You and Your partie are permitted to call your selves. From You it proceeds that the Ecclesiasticks of this Kingdom have not hitherto so much as endeavoured to convert us Roman Catholicks to their Religion: They have been unwilling to be informed what the true Differences between us

and

and themſelves are. As if true Reformed Religion did formally conſiſt in a blind, heady, and voluntary breach of Unity with all Churches before them. They have condeſcended to admit conferences with Sects, whoſe peculiar complexion conſiſting in an incompoſſibility with their government renders them irreconcileable, unleſs they yield up both their Faith and Eſtates. Yea for ſuch Enemies ſatisfaction (if any thing could ſatisfie them) they have ſubmitted to alterations even in their Church office and Diſcipline. Laſtly to content ſuch Engliſh Proteſtants as You, they have connived at your defiling, altering and deſtroying that which heretofore was called, and by Law ſtill is truly the *Engliſh Proteſtant Religion*: As will appear even by what You are ſuffered here to write againſt eminent perſons of their Church.

14. You proſcribe and expoſe to publick hatred Doctour *Gunning* and Maſter *Thorndike*, as perſons *that would ſeduce Engliſh ſubjects to Popery*. And what are your Proofs? Forſooth Doctour *Gunning* has preached before the King, and ſince printed, and beyond your skill to diſprove, has demonſtrated *that the Lent* *Doctour Gunning.*

faſt is an Apoſtolical Inſtitution. Where lies the Popery? It is, You ſay, againſt expreſs ſcripture. But is it therefore popery? Do no Sects contradict expreſs Scripture but Roman Catholicks? Behold the natural Logick of a Fanatick. However, let this expreſs ſcripture be produc'd. *Non liquet*, either in your Text or Margin. Well at leaſt, ſay You, *it is againſt an Act of Parliament.* Let me ask You and Your fellowes a Queſtion. Will You be content to ſtand to all *Acts of Parliament*, both as to their Prefaces and Clauſes, as Declarations of Faith: and this under the penalty of being eſteemed Papiſts: Then I here denounce You a Papiſt: For has not the whole *Liturgy* and *Diſcipline* of the Engliſh Church been ratified by Acts of parliament? But what will You ſay to an *Act of Parliament* that has declared, and like a Heretick burnt Your Covenant as a damned, trayterous conſpiracie? Take heed therefore You be not found your ſelf a papiſt. As for the Lent faſt, You know that by the Lawes of the Kingdom Biſhops are appointed the exacters and diſpenſers of the *Obſervance of Lent*: which ſhewes it to be eſteemed an *Eccleſiaſtical obſervance* as well as *Civil*,

So

So that I believe Dr. *Gunning* is in little danger from your charge.

15. God ſend Mr. *Thorndike* as good a deliverance: For his Charge conſiſts of more then one, or two, or three points of Accuſation: and every one of them ſeems to have an air of popery. Let them be examined. Firſt, ſay you, *he tells us in print that the Pope is not Antichriſt.* Item, *That Papiſts are not Idolaters.* Item by conſequence, *that all are Schiſmaticks who upon that ſcore do refuſe Communion with them.* Theſe are terrible points againſt good Mr. *Thorndike*: Yet, alas, not all his popery neither. *M. Thorndike.*

16. A time was when ſuch as You, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, could both undoe and deſtroy Engliſh ſubjects meerly upon an *accuſation of Popery*, without *proofe*. God be thanked it is otherwiſe now. Therefore You ought at leaſt to have produced ſome proofes that theſe Aſſertions are direct popery. But not having done it: let me adviſe you what kind of proofes will be expected. You muſt know therefore that it is a Law of the Engliſh Church, *that whatſoever is found in the Antient Canons, and is not expreſsly revoked by Eccleſiaſtical Authority in* England

gland, *is to be esteemed still in force.* And common sence and reason will tell you, that before you can by such allegations as these prove any one to have deserted the English Churches doctrine, and be turned a papist, you must produce some Authentick Declaration of this Church by which the Pope is decided to be Antichrist, and the Papists, Idolaters. But that is impossible for you to do. You will perhaps, to little purpose, cite the names of certain *Calvinistical Writers*, that, as you, hypocritically called themselves English Protestants: but withall you will take notice that all very Protestants have laughed at them, some have been angry, and demonstrated the direct Negative. If you were a live member of the English Church, you would know that the English Church would be no Church if the Pope were Antichrist, and the Papists, Idolaters. For would you acknowledg that to be a Church that enjoyes her whole Authority and Jurisdiction from Antichrist and Idolaters? Is she not rather a member and abortive of Antichrist? This is plain reason Mr. *Bagshaw*: and consequently the inference is undeniable, *That all are schismaticks who upon that score do refuse communion with the Roman Church.* 17.

17. You proceed againſt Mr. *Thorndike*, *He inſinuates*, ſay you, *that we may lawfully pray for the Dead.* Your proof, I told you, that this is againſt Proteſtancy, muſt be to ſhew where the Engliſh Church has repealed the Antient Canons commanding *Prayer for the Dead.* That will be a hard task. On the contrary You your ſelves obje& againſt the *Common-Prayer-Book* that there is a clauſe in it, that not only inſinuates it to be lawful, but actually exerciſes *prayer for the dead.* And you know that within the time of the four firſt General Counſels (received in *England*) above twelve hundred years ago your Progenitors were by the Univerſal Church declared Hereticks for denying it. Yea moreover that there was never extant any Liturgy or Miſſal in the Church of Chriſt, *Eaſtern* or *Weſtern*, wherein there were not *prayers for the dead.*

18. You go on. Mr. *Thorndike* againſt the Do&rine of the Church of *England* ſaies, *That we may expe& ſome benefit by the prayers of ſouls departed* (I ſuppoſe, *holy ſoules* are meant.) Where does the Church of *England* contradi& this? nay more, except you will acknowledg your ſelf to be a *Socinian*, and deny that the

ſouls of dead perſons have any ſubſiſtence at all with perception, and uſe of rational faculties, you your ſelf will not be ſo ſhameleſs as to deny what you here lay to Mr. *Thorndikes* charge. For I know none that call themſelves Chriſtians, except *Socinians*, but acknowledg that the glorified Saints do pray at leaſt in general for the Church Militant. Now if they all do pray for us all, will you not permit us to expect ſome benefit by their prayers? Muſt we maintain that all their prayers are to no purpoſe? O but you infer, *That this in time may eaſily be improved to our praying unto them.* As for this inference which is not your defendants, but only your own, give me leave to tell you: That if you believe that the Saints pray for the Church in general, it would be no hard matter by one *Syllogiſme* to oblige you to acknowledge that we may pray to God that he would hear and grant their prayers, making them beneficial to us. And now ſearch all the Solemn Offices and Miſſals of the Roman Church mark the prayers that occurrs every *Saints Feaſt*, you will find no other formes but ſuch as that: The prayer is alwayes directed to God alone immediately, and he is deſired to

grant

grant us such and such blessings by the intercession of such Saints. And if in less solemne Devotions, as *Litanies*, *Antiphons*, &c. we say, *Sancte Maria*, *Sancte Michael*, *Sancte Petre*, *ora pro nobis*: we are by the Church obliged to no other meaning then as before: and we imitate expres Scripture, *Laudate Deum omnes Angeli ejus*, *omnes Sancti ejus*, &c. Cardinal *Perron* will assure you that our prayers to Saints is only *prier pour prier*, a devout wishing that they would pray for us: And truly for my part I do heartily wish all the Saints in heaven to intercede in their prayers with God, that he would vouchsafe to give you (and us all) a sincere love both to truth and peace.

19. I have reserved your most criminal charge till the last, which you thus express, *If it be not the intent of some to returne into Ægypt, I cannot imagine what means the crying up of that great* Diana *of the Papists, the Churches authority, and making that the sole interpreter of Scripture.* What Religion can you possibly be of, and talk thus? You in your own person, standing alone, are not a Church. If you be but one member of a Church, what ever it be, as long as you

Preface.

you are ſo, you are ſubject to it, it muſt have Authority over you: the Spirit of one Prophet muſt be ſubject to an aſſembly of Prophets, are you an Independent? much freedom is implyed in that Title: yet I believe your Lay Church will think it has authority enough to oblige you not to interpret Scripture for the advantage of that court of Inquiſition, the Claſſes of the Presbytery. Are you a Presbyterian? Your private reaſon ſhall be yoaked and chained with bonds ſtrong enough, and heavy enough to keep it from ſtirring to the prejudice of the Holy brethren and Siſters. But you will needs call your ſelf an Engliſh Proteſtant, and yet will dare to revile all the Authority in your Church, boldly proteſting that it ſhall not interpret Scripture for you: Your private reaſon ſhall over-maſter it. Unleſs it confeſſe it ſelf to be no Church, that is, to have no Authority to oblige its members to receive the ſence of ſcripture from her, you will be revenged by bellowing aloud *This is the crying up of the great* Diana *of the Papiſts.* Truly I muſt needs ſay, the Church of *England* is a very patient Church, if ſhe ſuffer you to ſpeak this *Bedlam* language and injoy a Benefice too.

20.

20. But you do well, though you mean very ill, when you call this the *Diana of the Papists*: Since you imply that a true obliging Authority, if any where, can only be found in the Catholick Church. As for Sects that have no Succession of Ordination for such to assume Authority and Jurisdiction in matters of Religion, is ridiculous even to common sence: for it implies, that to be men which have an ordinary use of reason, is a sufficient qualification to become Ecclesiastical Teachers and Governours. The Clergy of *England* challenging a lawful Ordination, have some pretension to a real Authority: and if they could justify themselves free from the guilt of Schisme, even we Roman Catholicks could not deny but their Authority would oblige in conscience, and under the penaltie of damnation, because then it would be an Authority participating that of the whole Catholick Church, and acting in union with it But of this somewhat more in the last part of this Discourse.

21. I do apprehend, Mr. *Bagshaw*, that if you make any reply to this, you will, instead of speaking to the purpose, endeavour to aggravate the cause of Do-

&tour *Gunning* and Mr. *Thorndike*, by saying at adventure, that there is a secret intelligence between the Papists and them, and that they do mutually maintain one anothers quarrells. On the other side I am not without suspicion that some even of my own belief and Church, will think that it did not become a Catholike to busy himself with justifying the writings of protestants, especially when he endeavours to shew that such Writers are no Catholicks, though the particular points taught by them be real Catholick verities.

22. Now to both these I must say, that I never had the happiness to know or see either Do&tour *Gunning* or Mr. *Thorndike*: never was there any message or intelligence between us. But my only Motive to write as I have done, was to comply with that precept of God (*Pacem & veritatem diligite*) Love peace and Truth. As a true faithful English subject, I could not see so professed a disturber of peace without reproving him. As a catholick I could never hope (what I am bound to desire and aim at) that both truth and peace would find admittance into *England* by any endeavours either of Protestants or Catholicks,

till

till it was apparent what the true grounds of our ſeparation are: and this never will be known till other Sects be made to bluſh, when they impudently and perniciouſly both to the Church and State, call themſelves Engliſh proteſtants, and pretend to be judges of what is to be eſteemed in the Engliſh Church Catholick Doctrine.

23. Therefore for a concluſion of this argument touching your charge againſt Dr. *Gunning* and Mr. *Thorndike*, I will once more proteſt, that unleſs either the Civil or Eccleſiaſtical Authority do in time provide againſt ſuch writers as you, the whole Kingdom in a very ſhort ſpace will be in imminent danger to become a mere *Babel*. For if it ſhall be permitted to ſuch men, to defame any Engliſh Doctour or Writer that ſhall not conſpire in all the furious poſitions of Presbyterians, Independents, &c. againſt the Catholick Church, there will not be a Biſhop or ſober Divine in *England* that will not be at your mercy, both for his fame and ſubſiſtence, nay his life alſo, when you can either raiſe a tumult, or which is more dreadful, a *new Tribunal of Juſtice*.

III. *That*

III.

That Mr. Bagshaws *attempt to render only the Roman Catholick Subjects, in an incapacity of Toleration is in it self most groundless, and in his mouth most ridiculously malicious.*

1. WEE poor Roman Catholicks could not but be strangely surprised to see such a Protestant of the Church of *England*, as you Mr. *Bagshaw* are, to become our Advocat, and to beg our pardon saying, *Preface.* 'How ill an opinion 'soever I have both of the Papists Reli- 'gion, and of the unchristian waies they 'take to propagate it, yet far be it from 'me to wish, that amongst us they may 'suffer the same hard measure, which I 'know by their Principles, they are al- 'waies ready to inflict. For so much do 'I desire their conversion (which can ne- 'ver be sincere, unless it be voluntary 'and unconstrained) and so little fear 'their power of seducing (since their 'greatest strength lies in the ignorance of 'their followers, rather then in the cunning

'cunning of their guides) that I heartily wish all penal Lawes against them 'were utterly taken away: For I never 'yet saw any Argument that could clearly evince, why any sort of men who 'would profess a peaceable subjection 'unto the Civil Government, might 'not in all their Civil Rights be protected by it.

2. What a kind wish is here, and a reason for it truly unanswerable? Indeed here is Charity, a point too high to be believed sincere. Therefore to the end your Charity may be rational, do *not deprecate the inflicting of all punishment upon any, if you can indeed prove that by the Principles of their Religion they are obliged to inflict the like punishment on others.* As for our Principles, we protest unto you they are very innocent in this point. Laws indeed have oft been made in *Catholick Countries* very severe against those that the Church calls *Hereticks*. But they are none of the Churches laws: they were not enacted by *Ecclesiasticks* but by Civil Governours only. You know that by the Canons of the Church ever in force, the Clergy under penalty of *Irregularity* are forbidden to have any hand,

ſtand, either by Counſel or otherwiſe, in blood. And whatſoever Laws have been or ſhall be made by *Catholick Civil Governours*, eſpecially ſuch as reach to blood, if the Motive of them hath been pure Opinions of the Underſtanding, not prejudicial to Government, or any thing except a prudent mean to prevent Sedition or Rebellions juſtly apprehended, we aſſure you they are not made by the Principles of Catholick Religion, but againſt them.

3. You will object the *Spaniſh Inquiſition*. But withall be pleaſed to conſider, that almoſt all the Catholick Kingdoms in *Europe* beſides do abhorr the cruelty of that *Inquiſition*, and have often declared they will ſuffer the utmoſt extremities, rather than admit it.

4. This Charity of yours therefore was too exceſſive to be long-liv'd, or deſerving to be eſteem'd ſincere: for you preſently repent and revoke it, whilſt immediatly after you add, 'I muſt con-'feſs there are two things which do 'much difference the caſe of the Papiſts *Preface.* 'from that of any other Religious Sect 'this day in the World, and which ren-'ders the Toleration of them very un-'ſafe, if not unwarrantable.

5. How

5. How was it possible for one that wrote this cruel passage, not presently to blot out what with the same ink he had written immediatly before? The *King* and *State* are little beholding to you, when you wish that may be done, which is both *very unsafe and unwarrantable*: and besides, that may be done for *Roman Catholicks*, which you say *are the only Religous Sect in the World, which it is both very unsafe and unwarrantable to tolerate*: you except not even the *Fifth-Monarchists*, whose Religion forbids subjection to all Civil Governours whatsoever, and commands by Fire and Sword to erect their new spiritual Kingdom of Christ, which is to last *a thousand years*. Let but Papists be excluded, and all the monsters of Egypt are welcom to Mr. *Bagshaw*: Yet he must know that if there had been no Papists in the World, no other Sect among us had ever heard of Christ. Behold the mercies of a Presbyterian (or Independent, I know not whether) how cruel they are.

6. And all this he writes to prevent the benignity of Protestants, which he suspects may in some measure be extended as well to *Roman Catholicks* that

ſuffered with them, as to his own party that ſtill grieve they had not ſwallowed up both. He forgets what a converted criminal (as if it were ſome honeſt *Anabaptiſt*, or *Quaker*, one that had been, but now is no longer, a *murderer* and *ſeditious* perſon) ſaid to his obdurat companion, *Doſt thou not fear God, ſince thou art in the ſame condemnation? And we indeed juſtly: But theſe Men what have they done?* But we ſhould not much apprehend that his perſwaſion ſhould prevail with perſons that ſure ſhould now know us both, were it not that (by what unlucky ſtar we are ignorant) a perſwaſion has entred the minds of not a few among them, that there is a ſecret intelligence and Union of intereſts between Roman Catholicks and all our Sects, even to *Fanaticks*, and that they do all joyntly conſpire againſt *Proteſtants*. This opinion is imbibed by perſons of prudence, and otherwiſe well diſpoſed to contribute to the eaſe and comfort of *Catholicks*, were it not that the proofs of this accuſation are ſaid to be unanſwerable. Many Prieſts ſay they, are known to have been buſie in *Cromwels Army*: and even of late ſome *Catholicks* have ſided with Presbyterians, &c.

6. Now

7. Now what is left for distressed *Roman-Catholicks* to do in this case? *Protestations* and *Oaths* to the contrary, will not serve. Writings of this nature, if they be read by such, are slighted. *Quid verba audimus* (say they) *cùm facta videmus*? But if they see them, let the state see them too: Let some delinquents be produced. No: yet the thing is certainly true. But how comes this truth known to *Protestants*? Have the *Sectaries* discovered it? It is hard that their testimony should be taken: and though their professed hatred be notorious, it is unlikely they would forfeit their priviledge by the *Act of Indemnity*, meerly to do mischief to others. Are they Catholicks that have discovered this? They may easily be brought to a tryal: no Troops need be employed to apprehend them. And an unanswerable way of justifying the past severity of the State against us all, would be the arraignment of them, in case they can accuse any that have instilled unlawful principles or encouragements into them. If all the several bodies of Ecclesiasticks be not able to justifie both their Religion and practise, we renounce all mercy. But let it be granted that some Priests were in *Cromwells*

Army: who were they? Either ſenſual Apoſtates, or I am loath to ſay who, and they perhaps with a mind to ſerve the King: Or in caſe it ſhould happen, as poſſibly it may, that three or four raſh perſons, out of a tender affection and devotion to one party among Catholicks, whoſe exclusion they fear, to prevent that, ſhould enter into any practiſe without commiſſion even of that party it ſelf; hoping that ſuch an Act of theirs would be imputed to all Catholicks, and by that means hinder their Friends from being treated more ſeverely then all the reſt; would not Juſtice it ſelf complain, if even that party ſhould ſuffer for the raſh miſdemeanours of a few: but Juſtice would forſake the earth, if all the whole innocent body ſhould be made a ſacrifice for a crime ſo committed. It is a hard condition we are in: We actually ſuffer as if we were guilty of a crime, and are forced to gueſs what that crime (utterly unknown to our ſelves) can be ſuppoſed to be. All that can be ſaid in the preſent circumſtances muſt be, That if in reality we can be proved deſervedly obnoxious to a condemnation upon this charge, both the preſent and future

Age

Age ought to ſtigmatize us and our memories, as perſons not only in the higheſt degree criminal, but as ſuch who in a blind frenzy, after they had by ſuffering all extremities from powerful enemies twenty Years together for their Soveraign, obtained a ſufficient reward in being eſteemed by him conſtantly Loyal Subjects, and (as their hopes were) had withal ſufficiently freed their Religion from the ſcandal of infidelitie: afterwards when his *Majeſty* was reſtored to his power, and treated them with a mercy never before experienced by them, yea moreover when the Honourable Lords in Parliament after a gracious hearing of their defence, gave them hopes of future favour, juſt then they deſerted their Loyalty to the King: and entred into a combination with enemies alwaies implacable to themſelves, and at a time when thoſe Enemies had all power taken from them. This would be a complication of all crimes in one, a Treaſon joyned with the moſt prodigious ingratitude, moſt ſcandalous impiety, moſt barbarous inhumanity, and moſt brutiſh ſtupidity that ever was.

8. But Mr. *Bagſhaw* (who, I am aſſured, does not ſuſpect us, nay knowes

we are not guilty of this crime) calls me to hear his Reasons why *Papists alone should be ill-treated*: and I obey. You
Preface. say, *Sir, you have more then one reason which does difference the case of Papists from all other Sects, &c.* If this be true, then You had not so much as half a reason to *wish sincerely that the penal Statutes should be taken from them*: Nay that unlawful wish deserved punishment.

8. Let us see these Your evincing reasons. *One is*, say You, *their depending upon and owning a forraign power, &c.* If you had stopped at these words, we should have found no reply. For we confess, *such a power we depend upon and own*; but we utterly deny that that should put us in a worse condition then others. For if that Power be purely spiritual, that is, of a quite different nature, and not in the least degree prejudicial to the Kings Civil Power, but rather obliging those that acknowledg it, faithfully to obey the King, the owning of it surely ought to be no hindrance to a Toleration. If you think otherwise, then I must tell You that no Sect of Christians whatsoever ought to be tolerated in *England*. For let me ask You (who ever you are, whether *Presbyterian*

an, Independent, Anabaptiſt, Quaker, or even *Engliſh Proteſtant*) Do not you, and all of Your perſwaſion with You, depend upon and own a power diſtinct from his Majeſties Civil power, I mean, a power meerly Spirituall, or Paſtoral, not ſubordinate to the Kings, but to which the King himſelf, if he be of your Religion, ought to be ſubject, as being no Paſtour, but a Sheep, no Teacher, but a Hearer; no adminiſtrer of Sacraments, but a receiver; no Excommunicatour, but lyable himſelf, as all Chriſts flock are when they demerit it, to have Eccleſiaſtical cenſures inflicted on him? Such a power, I am ſure, you all acknowledge: And no other power do Roman Catholicks depend upon or own: Be not then ſo manifeſtly, ſo affectedly partial, as to alledge that to the prejudice and deſtruction of Roman Catholicks only, which muſt as well exclude all Chriſtians out of *England.*

10. But it is a forreign power, You ſay, that Papiſts depend upon and own, and this word *Forreign* makes the difference. It does indeed: But the difference is, I ſuppoſe, much to the advantage both of the King and Roman Catholicks too. For tell me for Gods ſake

ſince

ſince there is indeed a ſpiritual power from which Princes themſelves ought not to be exempted, nor can free themſelves from it without infinite prejudice to their own ſouls, is it not more for their temporal peace and ſecurity that this Spiritual power ſhould reſide in one ſingle perſon that uſually is both learned and diſcreet, and withal is a thouſand miles removed from our King, then in many thouſands within his own Kingdom, not all of them Angels, that if they have a mind to do him a miſchief, have all the means and opportunities imaginable? The *King of France* eſteems it a great priviledge granted him in a *Concordate* by the Pope, that no particular Biſhop ſhould have power in any caſe to excommunicate him: this power being reſerved by the Pope alone.

11. Therefore you do very well when for an eſcape to your ſelves You add, but very ill, when moſt calumniouſly to us You add, 'That Catholicks depend 'upon and own ſuch a power which ac- *Preface.* 'cording to the opinion of their teachers 'can when he pleaſes diſpenſe with them 'for, and releaſe them from their moſt 'ſacred engagements: So that a State 'can have no ſecurity, but that when

'ever

'ever they have opportunity they will 'endeavour a change: And their preſent 'peaceableneſs may juſtly be attributed 'merely to their want of ſtrength: which 'Bellarmine is not aſhamed to ſay was 'the ſole cauſe why the primitive Chri-'ſtians were content to ſuffer without 'reſiſtance. From which poſition, what 'can follow, but that it concerns the 'wiſdome and policy of every State to 'keep thoſe under, whom as to Temporal 'Subjection it cannot confide in.

12. *Imperet tibi Dominus.* Here the world ſees the charity of a Presbyterian, &c. in its natural colours. The Chriſtian charity ſo divinely commended by *St. Paul* has theſe qualities, *Non cogitat malum, &c.* 'It thinks no ill: It does 'not rejoyce in iniquitie, but rejoyces 1 Cor. 13. 'with the truth: It ſuffers all things; it be-'lieves all things, it hopes all things. But this mans new faſhioned charity thinks 'nothing but ill of all divided from his 'intereſts. It rejoyces only when any of 'them fall into any defects, and never re-'joyces at their well doing. It ſuffers no-'thing, whatſoever good they promiſe 'it believes nothing, it hopes nothing.

13. But truly, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, You have made choice of a moſt unſeaſonable time

to

to vomit forth these most spightful untruthes against Catholicks, with any hope they should be believed. In the last age indeed when the criminous Writings and practises of four or five Catholicks of one peculiar Order had justly incensed the *State*, and no way was afforded to all the rest publickly to defend themselves from an imputation of concurring with, and holding the wicked principles of a few Traytours, such a bloody accusation as this might perhaps find entrance into the minds of some few unwary persons. But now when such practises and principles have been heartily disavowed by all sorts of Catholicks: When the honourable Catholick Lords, have in the name of the whole body of the Catholicks, before a most glorious Tribunal made most confident protestations of an Eternal fidelity to the King, and of *renouncing all dependance on a forreign Authority that can any way be prejudicial to him*: When so many professions have been printed by several sorts of Catholicks declaring, *That no power upon earth can absolve them from their most necessary & natural Allegiance, nor so much as free them from the Obligation of any Promise or Engagement made to any private person*: When his Majesty himself

ſelf has honoured his Catholick ſubjects with ſuch a confidence in their Loyalty and ſincerity, as to truſt his life into their hands, when ſome (Mr. *Bagſhaw* knows who) ſought and hunted after that moſt pretious life; Laſtly when for the ſpace of twenty years a *fiery tryall* has paſſed upon the fidelity of Catholicks, and never could diminiſh it: Now, I ſay, after all this to hear this accuſation againſt them, out of ſuch a mouth as Mr. *Bagſhaws*, that *they depend on a Power that can releaſe them from their moſt ſacred engagements*, is beyond all ſufferance. What name can be found out worthily to expreſs ſuch a ſhameleſsneſs in a Presbyterian or Independent, none of whoſe party ever aſſiſted, but rather uſed all their power and skill to ruine the King, and after their Indemnity not one has appeared to make a publick promiſe of dealing better with him for the future? Who can with patience hear ſuch an one, 'tell the State, that 'it is concerned in wiſdom and policy 'to keep Roman Catholicks under, 'whom as to temporal ſubjection it can-'not confide in, when as not any one of 'them diſſerved the ſtate, but many thouſands have loſt their lives, and far more

more (almoſt all) are ruined in their eſtates for their fidelity only; and moreover to ſhew that this Fidelity was a Duty of their Religion, have and ever will be ready to give all ſecurity of peaceable obedience and ſincere integrity that Words or Actions can confirme? What can You expect, Mr. *Bagſhaw* ſhould be the fruit of ſuch a paſſage as this in a Book of Yours, but a guilty bluſhing in Your own party, indignation in loyal Proteſtants to hear ſuch as You become accuſers in ſuch a cauſe as this, and joy in Roman Catholicks, to ſee that none have of late taxed them as perſons not to be confided in, bu ſuch *old confiding men*, as after oathes of Fidelity have taken the Covenant and Engagements worſe then that, and but for an Act of *Oblivion*, *&c.* would in *Weſtminſter-Hall* hear, and not be able to anſwer a far heavier accuſation then this?

14. There are but two Oaths by the State accounted tryals of an Engliſh ſubjects fidelity, that of *Supremacy* and of *Allegiance*. If the former were but ſo expreſſed as to require an acknowledgement of a Civil Supremacy in his Majeſty only, excluſively to the Pope: And

if the unfortunate word, *Heretical*, were left out of the other, no honeſt Catholick would deſire to be allowed the priviledge of a ſubject if he refuſed either. And more then this, not any one Proteſtant, Presbyterian, or whoſoever he be that freely takes them, can intend by them. For not any of theſe will ſay that the Catholick Church of any Age has defind this Aſſertion to be Heretical, *That Princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, may be depoſed or murdered by their Subjects*: It being an aſſertion they never dream'd of: Neither will any of thoſe that make no ſcruples at either of the Oathes, allow a ſpirituall power, much leſs a Supremacy in that power to the King. So that it is evident that Catholicks are expoſed to the extremity of ſufferings for not taking oaths in the full importance of whoſe ſence they agree with all thoſe by whom they are perſecuted.

15. But truly now, ſince the State has moſt graciouſly been pleaſed to give a publick hearing to the Catholicks, ſpeaking by the Tongues of the Catholick Lords, &c. who have againſt all poſſible objections maintained the innocence of our Religion in the point of Fidelity:

And

And ſince it has been a general aſſeveration of Magiſtrates and the State, that they never had any intention to take away any mans life merely for his Religion and conſcience, as long as he was free from practiſing ſedition: Me thinks hereafter our *Juſtitiæ Sacerdotes*, the Reverend Judges ſhould find a great difficulty to perſwade their conſciences to permit their tongues to pronounce a condemnation, as for treaſon, againſt any Engliſh ſubject, meerly for having a ſcruple in an Oath to bring forth the word Heretical, he being at the ſame time ready to acknowledge, as due to the King, all the authority and right that the Judge himſelf does, when he condemns him for a traytour.

16. Therefore, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, if You would perſwade the State that it cannot confide in Catholicks, You muſt ſtudy ſome other motives: For *we heartily renounce the acknowledgment of any power that can diſpence with us, or releaſe us of our Engagements to his Majeſty.* They are none of our teachers that hold ſuch opinions. And what *Bellarmine* ſaies, *That the ſole cauſe why the Primitive Chriſtians were content to ſuffer without reſiſtance was their want of power*, we abhor, as a

ſpeech

ſpeech blaſphemous to the Holy Martyrs, and ſcandalous to the Church. Yet let me tell You, this was a Doctrine that *Bellarmine* might have learnt from Your Fore-fathers the antient *Puritans*, for out of them it is that Archbiſhop *Bancroft* quotes ſuch unchriſtian ſayings and words, as this for one, 'P*aul* commanding us to be ſubject and obedient to 'Princes, did write this in the infancie 'of the Church: there were but few 'Chriſtians then, and not many of them 'rich, or of ability, ſo as they were not 'for ſuch a purpoſe. As if a man ſhould 'write to ſuch Chriſtians as are under 'the *Turk*, in ſubſtance poor, in courage feeble, in ſtrength unarm'd, in 'number few, and generally ſubject to 'all kind of injuries, would he not write 'as P*aul* did? So as the Apoſtle did reſpect the men he wrote unto, and his 'words are not to be extended to the 'body or people of a Common wealth 'or whole City. For imagine that P*aul* 'were now alive, &c. and that there 'were ſuch Kings as would have their 'becks ſtand for Laws, as cared neither 'for God nor man, &c. what would he 'write of ſuch to the Church? Surely 'except he would deſſent from himſelf, he

Bancroft *in Dangerous Poſitions p.17*

'he would ſay, that he accounteth not 'ſuch for Magiſtrates, &c, he would 'leave them to their ſubjects to be pu-'niſhed, &c.

17. What think You of this Mr. *Bagſhaw*? Yet I will not accuſe You of holding the ſame. Nay more, though I can demonſtrate that there's not a Country or City in Chriſtendom into which Your Sect or Religion ever entred by any other waies but ſedition and Rebellion, witneſs *France*, *Geneva*, *Holland*, ſeveral States in *Germany*, *Switzerland*, *Scotland*, and (for almoſt twenty Years ſpace) *England*, yet if You would renounce that abominable principle, *That it is lawful to defend Religion by arms againſt a lawful Prince*, I ſhould have a ſcruple to ſay, that *a State cannot ſafely or warrantably confide in you*, as You have moſt unjuſtly ſaid againſt Roman Catholicks, taking advantage from one or two Writers generally diſallowed by us, though You can not name any one City or Country in Chriſtendom into which Catholick Religion ever entred but by ſuffering.

18. Do not therefore endeavour to make all Catholicks anſwerable for the wicked aſſertions of a few Authors, when You

you know they have been condemned by whole Kingdoms. You have eyes ſharp enough to ſpy even in the Catholick Church our ſort of Presbyterians and Independents, Yea even Quakers too: If any ſuch be in *England*, the State may eaſily convert them. However God be thanked their teachings are out of faſhion: and I would to God they diſpleaſed You as much as they do us. You know we can lay to your charge ten ſeditious Authours for one: and which is mainly (indeed, only) conſiderable, You are not able to produce one of your party that has condemned their horribly Rebellious principles. And as to the point of defending Religion by Arms, if by a Reply You will ſummon me to produce the particular paſſages, I will at large informe You, that during the reign of the laſt King of *France*, there was by his order propoſed to an Aſſembly of Catholick Biſhops this Queſtion or problem, 'If it were ſuppoſed that the King 'of *France* became *Mahumetan*, and by 'his power endeavoured to force his ſub-'jects to that infidelity, Whether they 'might lawfully, according to the princi-'ples of Chriſtianity, by arms againſt 'their Soveraign reſiſt ſuch an attempt

'of his? To which Queſtion the unanimous anſwer of the Biſhops was, 'That 'ſuch a reſiſtance would be unlawful: 'ſince Chriſtian Religion allowed no o-'ther way of maintaining the faith a-'gainſt lawful Soveraigns, but prayers, 'tears and ſuffering. When will *England* be ſo happy as to ſee ſuch a reſolution to proceed from a Synod of Presbyterians, &c. It would be ſome comfort to ſee but one, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, publiſh a little book to that purpoſe. Never certainly was there a more ſeaſonable time then now. That would be a powerful expedient to imprint the Act of Oblivion in the very hearts of all Engliſh ſubjects: And till ſome ſuch thing be done, *Quis Cælum terris non miſceat* to read from ſuch an one as Mr. *Bagſhaw*'s pen a Lecture of Fidelity to the King, and a warning given to the State, who the only perſons are not fit to be confided in?

Preface.

19. You add, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, *But could our Papiſts in* England *give ſufficient evidence of their hearty diſowning ſuch an irreligious Tenet, yet there is another thing, &c.* What ſay You Sir; *Could the Papiſts*? Why, have they not? Is their an ear in *England* that can perceive ſence,

and

has not heard what a profeſſion was made by the Catholick Lords in the Houſe of Peers? Is there an eye that can read, and has not ſeen their printed Declarations in which that irreligious Tenet was confidently, clearly and heartily Diſavowed? They have, do, and will proteſt, that if they be not ready to give all poſſible ſecurity of diſavowing that, and all other Principles prejudicial to Authority, Juſtice, and Peace, it would neither be prudence in his Majeſty, nor a juſt care of his Kingdomes welfare, to tolerate them among his Subjects. What would you require more?

20. If You think, or however, if You be reſolved to ſay, though You do not think ſo, that we *lye* when we both make ſuch proteſtations, and withall offer to confirme them by Oathes, You will put us into ſome puzzle how to give You ſatisfaction. Yet in order thereto, even to You that perhaps are unwilling to be ſatisfied, we tell You this. You cannot but know that Catholick Religion utterly forbids all *lying*, and above all, *Perjury*. If therefore You will judge, that neither the Proteſtations, nor Oaths of Catholicks, are to be credited, you

will condemn the State of want of prudence in contriving Oathes for tryals of their Fidelity: and moreover you muſt needs eſteem us the moſt impertident Lyars in the World, that is, ſuch as only lye when it is for our diſadvantage. If we durſt lye, we would much rather chuſe to lye by taking the Oathes in the formes as they are expreſſed, then make *voluntary falſe proteſtations* of the ſame duty that the oaths require: becauſe by taking the Oathes we ſhould free our ſelves oftimes from the loſs of our Eſtates, and ſometimes of our lives: whereas by ſuch Voluntary proteſtations we cannot challenge any temporal commodity: nay perhaps we anger thoſe, that take it worſe from us that we prove our ſelves good ſubjects, then they would, if we had been ill ones. This is all I can at preſent ſay to ſuch a ſcruple. If this ſatisfy not, God mend thoſe that are in fault.

21. Let us now ſee Your ſecond reaſon why only Papiſts muſt not be tolerated though they were never ſo good ſubjects. That You deliver in theſe words.

Preface. 'There is another thing practiſed by 'them, which makes it highly queſtio-'nable, whether a Kingdom profeſſing 'Chri-

'Chriſtianity ought to tolerate them in,
'& that is their Worſhipping of Images:
'which is a ſin ſo contrary to the expreſs
'letter of the Divine *Law*, and ſo re-
'pugnant to the common ſence and rea-
'ſon of all men, that God puniſhed it
'ſeverely even in the Heathen Chalde-
'ans, as well as in his own people the
'Jewes.

22. You are hard put to it, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, to find reaſons to kill Roman Catholicks. The ſaying is *Furor arma*; but it has put a ſtraw into Your hands, to wound us with. Yet I am likewiſe hard put to it too, how to defend my ſelf againſt even ſuch a weapon: that is, how to diſcourſe upon this point of Images with one that profeſſes he will neither accept Fathers, Councels, nor the whole Church it ſelf for an Interpreter of Scriptures, or Decider of Controverſies, but only his own private enlightned reaſon. It cannot be helped therefore: Reaſon alone muſt be judge between us: You will needs have it ſo. Let reaſon then be our judge, but upon condition that You will not call that reaſon which is againſt common ſence.

22. You ſay, *The worſhipping of Images is a ſin repugnant to the common ſence and* Fre-

reaſon of all ſober men: ſo that your common ſence and reaſon concludes, that there is not a Catholick in the world that is a ſober man, and not devoid of common ſence and reaſon: and by conſequence, all *France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Savoy, Greece, &c.* are but one large *Bedlam.*

1. 24. Well, however give one of theſe *Bedlam men* leave to propoſe to ſuch a ſober man as you are, that is all compounded of Reaſon, ſome few Queſtions, Firſt, then ſuppoſe there were repreſented to you while You were thinking of other matters, or talking, a picture of our Lord hanging on the Croſſe: could you poſſibly avoid the calling to mind who our Lord was, and what he had done or ſuffered for you? And if not being able to forbid the entrance of ſuch thoughts into your mind on ſuch an occaſion, would your reaſon dictate to you that you had done ill in changing your thoughts from the world to God, would you repent of it, asking pardon of God, and praying that ſuch a tentation might never befal you afterwards? Does your enlightned reaſon ſuggeſt this to you? Truely if it do, I believe you are of a temper of mind almoſt ſpecifically different

rent from all mankind beſides, and muſt change their nature before You make them of your perſwaſion, or Church. And yours is not a common ſence, if it either tell You that by Your beating down Croſſes and breaking Church windows, our good Countrymen think more of God then they did while thoſe remembrances were ſtanding: or if they think leſs, that it is better for them, to forget him.

25. To make a ſtep further, Let it be ſuppoſed that at the ſame time You ſaw before you ſeveral pictures of ſeveral perſons in quite contrary manner regarded by you, as of St. *Peter* and *Judas*, of our *Late Soveraign* and *Bradſhaw*: (you are beholding to me for this example:) Or put caſe you had in one hand a Bible and in the other the infamous ſtory of *Pantagruel:* does not your common ſence and reaſon tell you, that ſuch pictures or books force upon your mind quite contrary thoughts and affections, the which regard thoſe pictures or books not ſimply conſidered, but as repreſenting ſuch perſons, and containing ſuch matter? The which thonghts being juſt, and not at all harmful to you, and withal almoſt impoſſible to be avoyded, I can- 2.

not find any reaſon why reaſon ſhould forbid them: I am ſure common ſence will not.

3. 26. If then it be according to reaſon and common ſence, and likewiſe unavoydable to admit ſuch different thoughts: will not reaſon alſo warrant you to expreſſe outwardly by words or actions, whatſoever you may without any fault think inwardly? For my part I cannot imagine any ſcruple in this. If then I may and muſt think reverently or contemptuouſly of the Objects, I may as well ſpeak, or behave my ſelf externally after the ſame manner to them reſpectively; For whatſoever is ill or good in words or actions, is ſo likewiſe in thoughts.

4. 27. Now to ſhew that ſuch thoughts or affections regard not the perſons only but the pictures alſo as repreſentations of ſuch perſons, ask Your own heart and You will find that You would not place S. *Peters* picture, or the Kings in an unclean, diſhoneſt place. If any one ſhould ſpit upon either of them, your heart would riſe againſt him, and tempt you to ſtrike him: which it would not do, if the ſame contemptuous uſage were ſhewed to the picture of *Judas* or *Bradſhaw*.

Now

Now this is ſo naturally imbibed in the hearts of all mankind, that in all Kings Courts a reſpect and outward mark of reverence is required to the Chamber of preſence, or Chair of State: and a refuſal of it, much more a contemptuous behaviour, would be criminal. To apply this to the forementioned Books: You could not bring your reaſon to permit You to tear out a leafe of the Bible for an unclean uſe, as you could without the leaſt remorſe do to the ſtory of *Pantagruel* or *Æſops fables*.

28. Let us now conſider what kind of reſpect this is that we expreſs to ſuch images. Comparing the images of Saint *Peter* and our Soveraigns together, we find that a reſpectful regard is had to both, and a contemptuous uſage of either would diſpleaſe us: Yet it is not the ſame kind of reſpect: For St. *Peters* image we conſider as of a man that puts us in mind of heaven and heavenly things, one highly favoured by Almighty God, a principal Courtier in his Kingdom, and one that by his writings and example has been a great inſtrument of promoting our eternal happineſs. We do not ſo eſteem of every good King. Therefore to ſhew the difference of our 5.

re-

reſpect to each, we would chooſe to give St. *Peters* picture a place in our Oratory, and the Kings in our Gallery. But what names to give to theſe different reſpects is not eaſie to determine. It is plain, that which is given to the Kings picture is purely a civil reſpect: but what ſhall we call that which is given to St. *Peters?* If we ſay it is *Religious*, you will quarrel, as derogating from God. Let us therefore call it a *ſacred* veneration, or honour: For ſince all things that are appointed on purpoſe to mind us of God, of heaven and the ſalvation of our ſouls, we call them ſacred, this name may well be applyed to ſuch a picture. But moreover, becauſe there are not invented ſuch variety of names as there are things, and there are far fewer ſorts of outward poſtures of our Bodies denoting reſpect, then there are Names or Words: Hence it comes to paſs that when we would expreſs a Civil and a Sacred, yea a Religious reſpect, we are forced to uſe the ſame outward behaviour of bowing, kneeling, &c. to Fathers and Magiſtrates, that we do to God himſelf: Yea we find in the Scripture Kings *adored*, and a proſtration of bodies paid to them. Yet for all this no

man

man will ſuſpect that thereby any diſhonour was intended to God, or the Honour due only to him was paid to creatures.

29. In the next place let reaſon and common ſence give judgment of the diſtinction between the reſpect that may be paid to the picture of St. *Peter*, and that which ought to be paid to himſelf in caſe he appeared to us glorified as he is. A Divine reſpect we pay to neither, though ſometimes we uſe ſuch poſtures as we do when we pray, or worſhip God. It is then a *ſacred veneration* only: but yet there are ſome expreſſions of reſpect that we would uſe to the perſon, that would be ridiculous to the picture, as reverently to ſpeak to him, to beg his prayers to God for us, to ask a Queſtion, &c. 6.

30. Our laſt Enquiry ſhall be into the difference of regard (if any there be) to our Saviours picture and S. *Peters*, the former repreſenting to us him that is both God and man, the latter, meerly man. However we ſhall find that the regard to both the pictures is of the ſame ſpecies and nature, that is, only *ſacred*: becauſe a picture we never look upon but as an inſtrument to put us in mind, 7.

or

or to call to our memories an object: and therefore it being of our own frameing is not capable of any reſpect beyond that which is due to ſo material, inferiour a thing, what ever the object repreſented by it be. True it is that the internal affections and thoughts occaſionally raiſed in our minds will be infinitely different, for we ſhall think upon Chriſt with Adoration, Love, Reſignation and Obedience due to God only: not ſo of St. *Peter*: but the pictures themſelves will be treated by us as ſacred pictures only, that deſerve a reſpect proportionable: And ſince it is evident they are capable of a ſinful diſreſpect, conſequently a due reſpect may be paid to them. I ſay, *may be, not alwaies ought* to be: for then it would never be fit to put on ones hat, &c. in a room where there hangs a crucifix.

31. To ſumme up briefly our meaning in this whole matter: We find our minds too apt to be diſtracted from meditating on Divine things: therefore we help our ſelves by ſuch things as will call to our memories, and fix our thoughts upon Objects good for our ſouls to be thought upon: Such are holy pictures both in times of prayer and out, we find this

this benefit by them. Being ſuch ſacred things, we muſt renounce our reaſon, if we deny a reſpect may be due to them: but by honouring with an outward regard a picture, we intend only to give a teſtimony what reſpect we bear to the perſon or holy thing repreſented: And though for want of variety of poſtures, we ſhew ſome part of the ſame outward Reverence to the pictures of St. *Peter* and our Lord, yet that ſignifies, we only venerate *St. Peter* as a glorious Saint, yet a creature, but that we adore Chriſt as God: And no man that ſees or knows us can think otherwiſe. So that unleſs it be a ſin to ſhew outwardly what we are oblig'd to think inwardly, there is not the leaſt fault committed.

32. And now Mr. *Bagſhaw*, give me leave to acquaint You with Your miſtakes. *Firſt*, this reſpect called by the Church, Honour and Veneration, which We affirme may be paid to ſacred Images, you call *Worſhipping of Images*, meerly to make us odious to your ignorant Proſelytes: For Worſhip is commonly taken to be that Honour which is due only to God, and which we abhor to give to Images. But *Secondly*, you give it another name more abominable, calling

calling it, *Idolatry ſuch as God puniſhed in the worſt of Pagans.* Once at leaſt in your life ſpeak your conſcience: Do you think, or only ſuſpect that we Roman Catholicks do worſhip falſe Gods, and true Devils? Do we conſider our Images, as they did their Idols, to which by *Magical conjurations* they annexed an evil Spirit to do wonders, and to extort Divine worſhip from the ſeduced people? Take heed *Sir* how you perſiſt in ſo unjuſt a blaſphemy againſt Gods Church: A time will come that You will be called to a ſtrict account for it: it concerns you therefore to make ſome reparation.

33. But after all this, take notice that the Catholick Church, though it declare that ſuch a veneration may fitly be given to Holy Images, as common Reaſon, and Humane nature cannot chooſe but allow: Yet it commands none to afford them but even ſo much. You may be a Roman Catholick all your life, and yet never be obliged to performe any external reſpect to an Image. There is not in Catholick countries a Groom or Kitchin-maid ſo ignorant, but would rather burn an Image, then afford it any honour due to God only.

only. And ſhall thoſe that think thus, and do only what humane reaſon generally approves and cannot hinder, be eſteemed and publiſhed by you *the only Chriſtians in the World fit to be thruſt out of all Chriſtian Kingdomes, and executed as traytours*, though otherwiſe they be acknowledged moſt faithful, peaceable men and obedient Subjects? Are you not afraid of, *In quo judicio judicaveritis judicabimini?*

34. You ſee *Sir*, how ſince you will not admit of Authorities to juſtify the Beliefe and Practice of Roman Catholicks, but only common ſence and reaſon, I have complyed with you: And now in one word tell you, that You muſt never hope to make any ſober man believe that Roman Catholicks are Idolaters, or even faulty in the matter of Images, till You can demonſtrate, 1. *That* it is unlawful to make uſe of our Seeing faculty to put us in mind of God. 2. *That* he diſhonours the King that ſhall with reverence, bareheaded, and in a kneeling poſture receive a Letter or Mandate that comes from him. 3. *That* it is a contempt of God to go through a Church with ones head uncovered. 4. And that it is unlawful, and irreligious

to

to make a ſcruple of uſing a leaf of the Bible in the houſe of Office.

35. For a farewel I will conclude this point with a Story, the truth whereof ſeveral Gentlemen, Proteſtants too, in this Town are able to juſtify. 'In the 'year 1651. a devout *Italian Friar* being 'appointed to preach in the *Great Dome* 'at *Padua*, the Archbiſhop preſent, and 'having been informed that among his 'Auditors there were ſome Engliſh Pro-'teſtants, that in diſcourſe had earneſtly 'objected (as you do) Idolatry to Ca-'tholicks, He therefore that he might 'occur to ſuch a ſcandal, made choice of 'the Doctrine concerning Images for the 'ſubject of a great part of his ſermon. 'And when he came to that point, hold-'ing in his hand a Crucifix, he told his 'hearers, That that Image did in one 'glance lively repreſent, even to the moſt 'ignorant beholder, *our Lord Jeſus, God* '*and Man*, and almoſt all the circum-'ſtances of his moſt bitter and accurſed 'death ſo patiently and willingly ſuffer-'ed for us. Thereupon with great paſ-'ſion and Rhetorick he magnified the 'Love of our Lord hanging on the 'Croſs, earneſtly preſſing his hearers to 'return a proportionable Love and Duty

to

'to him. And during this diſcourſe, he 'often with great reverence and tender- 'neſs of affection embraced and devoutly 'kiſſed the Crucifix. Having ſaid much 'to this purpoſe, after a little pauſe he 'purſued his Diſcourſe, telling them he 'could not believe or ſuſpect, that any 'one that had heard and ſeen what he 'had ſaid and done, could reaſonably 'imagine that he had any intention to 'diſhonour our Lord, by that which he 'had done to the Crucifix which repre- 'ſented him, much leſs that he adored 'it, as if he thought it a kind of God, that 'he put his truſt in it, as expecting any 'good from it, as if (he knew not what) 'Divinity, Vertue or Sanctity was in 'that carved piece of wood. Notwith- 'ſtanding becauſe he had heard that ſuch 'a ſcandalous imputation was by ſome 'miſperſwaded perſons laid on the 'Church, he would then and there un- 'deceive them. Thereupon he ſpit up- 'on the Crucifix, threw it ſcornfully 'to the ground, and trampled it under 'his feet.

36. You ſee, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, what kind of Idolaters the *Papiſts* are. Againſt this *Idolatry*, let us ſee what *expreſs Scripture* you can produce. This is the great

crime, for which there can be no expiation but *oppreſſions*, *empriſonments* and *Gallowſes*. Now if what hath been here ſaid give you no ſatisfaction, in caſe you have a mind to reply, do not practice your old way of ſnatching a phraſe or expreſſion out of a ſingle *Authour*, a *Schoolman* or *Controvertiſt*, and making the whole Church anſwerable for one mans indeſcretion. But ſearch what the Church her ſelf has declared in the Council of *Trent*, and diſpute againſt that as well as you can: and be aſſured you ſhall either be anſwered, or elſe told that you are unconquerable.

VI.

IV.

That Mr. Bagſhaw's *whole Diſcourſe againſt the Churches Infallibility is nothing to the purpoſe.*

1. HItherto of your Preface: Now I come to your book: which truly will afford very little buſineſſe. And in groſſe concerning your grave Diſcourſe I muſt tell you, That if you would be as merciful to our Eſtates and

our

our Lives as You are to this our fundamental Doctrine, we should find You a a very commodious Adversary: For notwithstanding all your blustring You have not given this Doctrine one blow that smarts at all: But God bless us from Your Swords, and Your *Sermons*.

2. The Title of your book is, *The great Question about the Infallibility of the Pope and Church of Rome*: This Question you undertake to determine. We are likely to have good stuff in a Book that mistakes the subject to be discoursed on. You should not have said, *The great Question about, &c.* but 'Two Questions, 'the one a great one, about the Infallibi-'lity of the Roman Catholick Church: 'which if it be disproved, destroys the 'foundation of that Church: the other a 'very little question about the Popes per-'sonal infallibility, in which the Church 'it self is not concerned at all, but only 'Cardinal *Bellarmine*, and a few Writers 'zealous for that Court. And when you had said this, in all reason, having a design to triumph over Roman Catholicks, you ought not to have said a word about this little, trifling, unconcerning Question, but have bent all your forces against that Great one which was only to the purpose.

 3. But

3. But You very wiſely have ſpent your whole book upon it only, though a ſubject that You your ſelf in your Preface confeſs, *is not yet decided in the Schools amongſt learned men*, which is as much as to ſay, no Catholick is obliged to maintain, and conſequently no Proteſtant needs trouble himſelf about it: Nay moreover you ſay *the two Councils of* Baſil *and* Conſtance, *and* (in your Book) *the ſixth General Council* have (vertually) decided the contrary, having preferred the Authority of a Council above the Pope, which therefore may reverſe his deciſions, and actually condemned a Pope of Hereſie: you might have added the ſeventh and eighth General Councils which ratifyed the ſame condemnation: and to them You might have joyned Pope *Agathon* the ſucceſſour of Pope *Honorius*, that was condemned, and his Succeſſours Pope *Leo the ſecond* and the reſt till Pope *Adrian the ſecond*, who lived in the time of the eighth Council.

4. Why do You write Books Mr. *Bagſhaw*, ſo confeſſedly to no purpoſe at all? And why do you trouble your ſelf about a ſubject that the Authour whom you pretend to confute, cannot himſelf be-

lelieve, what ever opinion or ſuſpition he may have of it? For no Catholick can be ſaid to believe any thing as a Chriſtian Verity merely upon diſcourſe of Reaſon, or probable deduction from Scripture, but only when ſuch a verity appears either expreſsly contained in the Bible, or is formally decided by a General Council, or received by unqueſtionable Tradition of the Church. Now it is apparent, even out of *Bellarmine* himſelf, that none of theſe wayes the Popes Infallibility has been confirmed: Nay more, *Never yet has any Pope declared that himſelf is Infallible.* But you are wiſe in the midſt of folly. You write out of all danger of being confuted, becauſe no body thinks himſelf touched: ſo that you have an eaſie and cheap triumph of it. Notwithſtanding by your own example I do much doubt your *Honourable patron*, by whoſe command, You ſay, You wrote, finds not his expectation anſwered; if he did expect any great matter: and I am ſure being very knowing and wiſe he will not believe that (as you brag) *you have killed the Enemy, having left no Argument unanſwered*: ſince evidently you have miſtaken your enemies perſon through

Epiſt. Dedic.

your whole book, excepting only the two laſt leaves, where *obiter*, and in anſwer to an Objection ſuppoſed to be made by moderate and ingenuous Papiſts you make an offer to ſpeak *de tribus capellis*, that is, *the Pope's being infallible, not in himſelf, but in and with a Councill*: which though it be the only matter in queſtion, you call only a *Conceit, of which you will ſpeak a little*, and you keep your word, you ſay very little, and that little to no purpoſe at all.

5. Therefore to what purpoſe ſhould any Catholick ſet pen to Paper to anſwer you, ſince if you be never ſo evidently confuted, you are excuſed from yielding by ſaying *you have ſaid a very little*, but could have ſaid more: and Catholicks are forbidden to yield, ſince they have a world of proofs to demonſtrat, the *Infallibility of the Church*, far more efficacious then theſe one or two Texts of Scripture called out by you for your beſt advantage. And even theſe Texts as they are produced and made uſe of by Catholicks are unanſwerable, eſpecially to thoſe that think it reaſonable to admit that to be the ſence of Scripture which all antiquity has given, which all proteſtants and all reaſonable men do.

They

They could not foreſee that there could ariſe a Diſputant ſo void of reaſon, as Mr. *Bagſhaw*, to whom the whole conſent of all Ages of the Church, all Councils and Fathers appeared light and inconſiderable, if compared with his ſingle reaſon. Therefore till you have proved that Ground demonſtratively, that is, turned ſand into a Rock, you are not in a capacity either to object or anſwer.

6. And to the end you may ſet upon ſuch a work to ſome purpoſe, I pray pleaſe to enquire out a Book called *Exomologeſis*, or *Motives of the Converſion &c.* where your great *Laniſta* Mr. *Chillingworths* reaſons for ſuch a poſition are pretended to be anſwered; and in an Appendix to that Book You will find an *Examination of the Fundamental Grounds of my Lord* Faulklands *Diſcourſe* on that Subject. Theſe are the men you brag of in Your Preface as your great Patrons, that is indeed, ſuch Proteſtants as you are, that lay ſuch grounds as utterly demoliſh the whole ſtructure of the Engliſh church, denying that any Authority upon Earth can oblige any man. And this very thing, I mean, the *deſtruction of the Church of England* you *Preface.*

Preface. your ſelf confeſſe in your Preface to have been the Deſign of your ſmall Treatiſe, though written againſt Papiſts: adding

ib. that, 'Nothing can be more unrea-'ſonable then this, that thoſe (Churches 'or Church-Rulers) ſhould Lord it over 'the Faith or conſcientious perſwaſion of 'other men, who are not certain but 'they may err and be deceived them-'ſelves: For that would be to take the Pope's Chair, and ſucceed into his room.

7. This therefore having been by your ſelf acknowledged your Deſign, I muſt repeat what I have already ſaid: That the Engliſh Biſhops and Clergy are far more intereſſed in your Book, for all the Title be only againſt Catholicks, then Catholicks are. But as to this horrible poſition of Yours, which utterly deſtroys all Order and peace: Let me tell You that to particular Churches and Church-Rulers (if they be members of the Catholick Church) infallibility is not at all neceſſary to make their Doctrines or Orders obliging even in conſcience: Becauſe all their ſubjects whileſt they remain ſo, are bound, I do not ſay to believe internally, but not to contradict their declared Doctrines, and

to

to ſubmit to their Orders: the refuſing of either perhaps not damning, but certainly excluding the refuſers from an outward communion with that Church. So that here you plainly, *exerto Capite*, tell the World you are no Engliſh proteſtant, though perhaps you would fain have an Engliſh Benefice, and preach againſt order in Engliſh pulpits.

8. Now as for that *Great Queſtion of the Infallibility of the Church*, which You conſider only as *the conceit of ſome few Catholicks*, if You have a mind to write any thing to the purpoſe, to prevent Your miſtaking (if that be a poſſible thing) give a well-wiſhing friend leave to informe you in general, *That there is extant no formal Deciſion of the Church touching her own infallibility*: Notwithſtanding all Catholicks are bound to acknowledge her to be infallible, by a neceſſary conſequence of an eſſential Article of the Creed. Which conſequence You may conceive to be thus deduced, *viz.*

9. *Firſt*, it is an Article of our Creed *Credo unam Sanctam Catholicam & Apoſtolicam Eccleſiam*, that is, *I believe one* (and but One) *holy Catholick and Apoſtolick Church*. By which Article ſincerely

eerely professed, the person, declaring himself a Christian, signifies a necessity of his being truly a member in Communion with that One Church, and consequently renounces all other Congregations, and all Ecclesiastical Communion with persons divided from that One Church.

2. 10. In the *Second Place*, Your only Guide, common sence and reason tells us that a multitude cannot be called *One Society*, except they be joyned and linked together by a Government and Lawes common to all. And therefore the whole Catholick Church, being indeed one Body (as St. *Paul* sayes) and one General Congregation, it must necessarily have both general Rulers, and Common lawes universally obliging, which does not at all hinder but that under and within that general Congregation there may be many distinct Societies enjoying particular Lawes, Priviledges and Rulers, upon condition they do not contradict, nor refuse to submit to the said general Laws, Tribunals and Governours.

Vid. Longū Sumā Concilior. præludio 9. p. 69.

3. 11. *Thirdly*, our Lord having expressly promised to preserve and continue this Church, as one Society, to the end of

of the World, ſo as that *the Gates of Hell ſhall never prevail againſt it*: it followes undeniably, that he has provided ſufficient and efficacious means to preſerve this unity: for otherwiſe one *Article of the Creed* might happen to fail.

12. *In the fourth place*, ſince univerſal Experience both in Humane and Divine matters teſtifies, that never any *Writing*, *Law*, or *Science* could yet be ſo expreſſed, but that being left to the wits, *enlightned Reaſon*, and intereſts of particular men to deſcant upon them, there would follow differences of ſences and interpretations, and conſequently *Diviſions* and ſeparated intereſts deſtructive to unity: to provide againſt which the only poſſible remedy hath alwaies been acknowledged to be the conſtituting of an *External* laſting *Authority* of *Judges* and *Magiſtrates*. Hence it is, that the *Supreme Tribunal of a General Council* has evermore hitherto been confeſſed by all *Chriſtians* to be the only preſervative againſt a breach in the univerſal Church: and becauſe it cannot alwaies be poſſible to ſummon ſuch an Aſſembly, therefore by way of proviſion the *ſupreme Paſtour* of the Church hath alwaies exerciſed, in matters that con- 4.

cern

cern the *common Faith*, and *Diſcipline*, an *Authority*; if not to decide, at leaſt to compoſe and ſilence all differences in Opinions, &c. and to put in Execution the *Ordinances* of precedent Councils.

13. Now if You will diſcourſe to any purpoſe in oppoſition to this (as I know You have a great *Tooth* againſt it) You muſt either demonſtrate that there is no need at all that controverſies ſhould be compoſed and *Schiſmes* healed: Or if You cannot do this, You muſt contradict the Experience of all mankind, by ſhewing that *Judges* are not neceſſary to end *Law-ſuites*, *that writings* alone with *enlightned reaſon* will do the buſineſs: and eſpecially that above all Lawes and Sciences, the *Holy Scriptures* that are in ſome places infinitely obſcure, and in plain places compiled in a popular ſtile, far from that ſtudied exactneſs of Lawes and Sciences, are moſt proper to have their ſence agreed in. This muſt be your task, and to make it good, it will be expected that You ſhould do one *miracle* more, which is, to produce but one Example during ſixteen hundred years and upwards, taking in the Apoſtles times, if You pleaſe, to ſhew that

diffe-

differences in Religion have been prevented or compoſed, and ſeparations of divided Churches re-united by diſputing out of Scriptures alone, without ſubmiſſion to a common Tribunal. On the contrary ſide we *Catholicks* will be obliged to ſhew you that all Hereſies hitherto appearing have been ſo far deſtroyed by General Councils, that the Church has been preſerved in Unity, and we are confident will be ſo for ever, notwithſtanding even ſo formidable an Adverſaries oppoſition, as you are.

14. In the fifth place, This great Tribunal of a General Council is of an Authority ſo authentick, that no Appeal from it muſt be admitted. Yea moreover it has influence not on the outward actions or profeſſions only, but even the judgments and hearts of all particular Catholick perſons and Churches. This appears not only by the univerſal agreement of all Fathers and Eccleſiaſtical Writers paſt and preſent, but by the ſolemn ſtile of the Decrees made by all ſuch Councils, in which *Anathema*'s have been denounced againſt all Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, and they ſeparated from the Myſtical Body of Chriſt, to which alone Salvation is promiſed. 5.

15. In

6. 15. In the laſt place therefore, the Church being one, and to keep it ſo, Authority having been communicated to it by our Lord, which Authority for that purpoſe muſt needs under penalty of an Eternal ſeparation from Chriſt oblige all Chriſtians to ſubmit even their minds to it, it ſeems to us that it followes neceſſarily and inevitably, *that the Church is infallible*: Unleſs we would ſay, that our Lord has commanded us to hear ſuch a Church and Guide as might lead us to Hell. To prevent all ſuſpicion of which he has expreſly promiſed to lead (not the Apoſtles only, as you fancy, but) *his Church into all Truth, with whom* he ſaid he would *be preſent to the end of the world*, thouſands of years after the Apoſtles were dead.

16. Theſe you may ſuppoſe, Mr. *Bag.* to be the true grounds of the Churches Infallibility. It is Infallible becauſe it is *One*, but, it is ſuch an *One* from which as Separation is damnable. So that if you, a Presbyterian, or Independent, &c. have a minde to aſſault theſe grounds; then
1. You muſt firſt deſtroy that Article of our Creed, *I believe one Catholick Church.*
2. Next you muſt prove out of expreſs Scripture

Scripture not only that Scripture is our only Rule, but that we have no other Guide to find out the ſence of it but only our private reaſon or ſpirit: and what theſe joyn'd together conclude upon, will infallibly ſerve our turn, whether it be true or falſe. 3. That all the Antient Church and all Proteſtants too are miſtaken when they ſay that Schiſm, (to you the moſt innocent thing in the World) is a *Sin*, a great exterminating *ſin, for which there cannot poſſibly be a juſt cauſe*, or ſufficient excuſe. 4. Laſtly, you muſt have the confidence befitting a Presbyterian to ſay, that all Chriſtians before you have been poor ſpirited ſheepiſh, deceived people, that knew not what the Liberty of a Subject was: and that all General Councils that preſumed to denounce *Anathema's* againſt the private ſpirit or enlightned reaſon, have been moſt abhorred conſpiracies of Tyrants over Mens ſouls.

17. Whereas if you were an Engliſh Proteſtant truly ſo called, (but the very ſuppoſition is unſufferable, and therefore muſt be changed, therefore I ſay) whereas a true Engliſh Proteſtant would proteſt his readineſs to ſubmit both his tongue and ſoul to a lawful General Council

Council, and consequently would have no quarrel against the Infallibility of the Universal Church: He would admit Tradition to be the best Interpreter of Scripture: Only his Controversie-humour would spend it self against the *Roman Churches* pretention to the Title of Catholick, and would maintain that the English State and Clergy had authority enough to reform themselves without consulting the *Roman*, or any other *Churches*: Indeed if the *Eastern Church* had still been in Union with the Roman the case then would be altered. The English Church on such a supposition would have had a scruple to oppose both.

18. Therefore since it is not in our power to oblige the *Turk* to permit the Eastern Bishops to meet in a General Council with the West: for English Protestants sake (not yours, good Mr. *Bagshaw*) I will take upon me a little more then your Book can require from me, and that is to propose in the mean time a convenient mean and expedient towards the removing this scruple: and that is as followeth.

19. Since we cannot have speaking Judges that will please them, they may,

I ſuppoſe, do well to help themſelves with Books: and for that purpoſe pitch upon ſome well known time in which the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches* were united, and out of the *Books* and *Monuments* of that *Age* impartially collect the Doctrines then taught, and the Church-government then in uſe through the whole Church: For thereby it will evidently appear whether of the *Churches*, *Eaſtern* or *Weſtern* that now differ in both, have deſerted that which was anciently in both.

20. Now I conceive a more proper time for this purpoſe cannot be imagined then the *Age* of the *Church* in St. *Gregory* the great's time when *England* was converted from *Paganiſme* by St. *Auguſtin* the Monk ſent by him. For it is evident that the whole Church was then in perfect Union: the ſame Doctrines were taught, and the ſame Government and Common laws in uſe all the Chriſtian World over. Beſides, there are extant more, better and clearer Monuments both of the Doctrines and Diſcipline of that Age then in any other: and eſpecially in St. *Gregories* Epiſtles ſent into all quarters of the World, and in other of his works tran-

ſlated into the Greek tongue, and freely embraced, yea admired by the Greek Church, we may find what Authority ſo learned and Holy a Pope exerciſed over other Churches according to the then received Eccleſiaſtical Canons. Moreover beſides S. *Gregories* Works, our own Country both by writings of learned men, Councils of Biſhops, and viſible Marks in the foundation of Churches and Monaſteries, will moſt abundantly furniſh us.

21. Now when we have found what in that age was the Belief and practiſe of the whole Church uniformly: Then we are to confront thereto the Doctrines and Diſcipline of the preſent *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches:* Being aſſured that both of them have not deſerted the Antient Belief and practiſe: becauſe if it were ſo, there would not now be extant any *Orthodox Church* at all; and conſequently our *Saviours promiſe* of *leading his Church into all Truth* would have failed.

21. Now when it ſhall appear unto us whether of theſe two great Churches hath preſerved the *Antient faith* and *Diſcipline*, we ſhall neceſſarily be obliged to a Communion with that Church: becauſe

because a separation from it will be a manifest Apostacy and Schism from the most certainly *one, true, Catholick Church*, and consequently from *Christ* himself.

22. Now that the present Roman Church does at this day profess the very same Doctrines, and is governed by the same Laws, that were in force in St. *Gregories* dayes, will as seems to us evidently appear both from his Writings, the Ecclesiastical Writers since, and the Antient English Councils: as likewise by the acknowledgment of several learned Protestants. To this purpose Doctor *Humphreys* writes thus, *In Ecclesiam verò quid invexerunt* Gregorius & Augustinus? *Onus cerœmoniarum*, &c. that is. 'But 'now what have *Gregory* and *Austin* 'brought into the Church? A burden of 'Ceremonies, &c. the Archiepiscopal 'Pall to be used at Solemn Mass, Pur-'gatory, &c. the Oblation of the Holy 'Host and prayers for the Dead, &c. 'Relicks, &c. Transubstantiation, &c. 'new Consecrations of Churches, &c. To these particulars *Carion* a *Chronolo-'gist* adds the publick Rite of Invocation 'of Saints, a false perswasion concerning 'a Monastical profession, works devised

Humphr. Jesuitis *in par.* 2. *rat.* 5. *p.* 5. & 627.

Carion. Chron. *l.* 4. *p.* 567.

'without any precept of God, satisfactions, vowes, &c. And whereas (saith he) 'Gregory himself did tragically declaim, 'and profess his abhorring the Title of 'Universal Bishop, yet in reality he de'clared that himself did vehemently de'sire the thing signified by that Title, 'since he took upon him a commanding 'power over other Churches. To these may be added the Centuriators of *Magdeburg*, *Bale*, &c. who mention these and other particular Doctrines, as Novelties introduced by *St. Gregory*.

23. Hence if our Adversaries speak truth it will evidently follow, that since there are now differences between the *Eastern* and *Western Churches*, all the alterations and innovations have been made by the *Greek Church* only.

24. Do you not now see, Mr. *Bagshaw*, what Religion that is, the professours whereof you, as far as your vote extends, expose to the Butchery? whence is apparent, that if you had been a leader of a party able to execute your cruel intentions in S. *Gregories* dayes, you would like a very *Antichrist*, have laid wast the whole *Church of Christ*, and murdred all that were called by his name. There wants only this to crown your zeal, that

you

you ſhould cry out, *Their blood be upon us and upon our children.* Thus would you have treated S. *Auguſtin* and his fellow *Monks*, you I ſay, that the leſs Charity you have, eſteem your ſelves the more perfect Chriſtians and Saints, you would have condemn'd to *Gallowſes, quartering of members*, and *burning of bowels* thoſe innocent perſons that expoſed themſelves to all incommodities for the ſalvation of our Country: when as our *Pagan Anceſtors*, though Slaves of Devils, yet treated them with all humanity. Take heed they do not *riſe in judgment againſt you*: I am ſure in that great Judgment you ſhall not riſe to condemn them for this ſin.

---

1. THus *Sir*, I have performed as much as I promiſed in the beginning: and truly I promiſed more then your Book deſerved: In which I found ſo very ſmall a proportion of Reaſon employed, that I may perhaps incur cenſure for miſpending time about a Diſcourſe that would not indanger the miſleading of any. I muſt therefore plainly tell the Reader that it was only your *paſſion*, Your cruelly malicious ſugge-

ſtions that I intended to oppoſe: That is your proper *Engin* to do miſchief with, to prevent which, a Chriſtian compaſſion to thouſands of innocent, peaceable ſouls whoſe deſtruction your paſſion deſignes, does require all honeſt mens endeavours and care. You acknowledge *enlightned reaſon* for your only Principle: but I find that which You call by ſuch a name to be nothing elſe but a reſtleſs fancy, ſwelling with ſelf opinion, and inflamed with almoſt all ſorts of inordinate paſſions, ſharpned againſt all moderate perſons, both Proteſtants and Catholicks, that is, againſt all that have any ſence of Duty to the King, or love of peace among Chriſtians.

2. Now as among *Proteſtants* You thought fit to ſingle out only two, Doctour *Gunning* and Mr. *Thorndike*, through whoſe ſides You would wound all that are not as furious againſt peace as your ſelf: So among Catholicks likewiſe there are two, my Lord the Earle of *Briſtow*, and the Authour of *Fiat Lux*, againſt whom you have thruſt forth a forked ſting armed with poyſon enough, but wanting ſtrength to make that poyſon enter. I hope his Lordſhip will pardon a ſtranger, yet an admirer of his

Earle of Briſtow. *Fiat Lux*

his moſt eminent abilities and vertues, for taking notice without order from him, of your malicious reflexions upon him, which might be prejudicial to his Honour, were it not that it comes from a perſon that I am aſſured he will never dignify with anſwering.

3. You reckon his Lordſhip in the Catalogue of thoſe who have ſhewed the 'vanity and uſeleſsneſs of Allegations 'of Authorities, of Fathers, and Coun- 'cils, &c. And becauſe (*ſay you*) it is 'poſſible that the example of that Ho- 'nourable Perſon may be urged againſt 'me, ſince his preſent practiſe doth con- 'tradict his former principles, I will only 'add this, that ſince his book is not 'yet anſwered by himſelf, I hope he 'thinks it unanſwerable, and will not 'long continue in communion with that 'Church, whoſe foundations he hath ſo 'well overthrown. An Admirable paſ- ſage this is, fit for no pen but Mr. *Bag- ſhaws*. *Preface.*

4. That his Lordſhip has not yet publiſh'd an Anſwer to a Writing of his own, ſufficiently confuted by his practiſe, I ſhould rather think you might have imputed to ſuch as your ſelf. Theſe are not times for any of his Lordſhips

preſent perſwaſion in matters of Religion to multiply unneceſſary controverſies of that Nature. And however, your ſelf and your party afford ſuch as his Lordſhip is buſineſs enough to exerciſe all their abilities prudence and skill, in oppoſing your ſecret workings and open calumnies, by demonſtrating that a change in his perſwaſion about points of faith doth make no change at all in his Fidelity. And thus much his Lordſhip (in the name of all Catholicks) to your great grief has performed with that ſincerity, candour and energy, that I am confident there is not a Proteſtant that ſhall read your infamous aſperſions caſt upon *Catholick Religion*, touching the matter of Loyalty, but will look upon them as the laſt effects of the deſperate rage of one that takes pleaſure in mere calumniating, without any expectation to be believ'd.

5. And truly, *Sir*, if you had taken to task the making the World believe that in your Sect Chriſtian Charity is eſteemed a mortal ſin, you could not have better effected your deſign then by ſaying, as you have done, *I hope his Lordſhip thinks his Book unanſwerable*, &c. For ſhame change this phraſe, *I hope*, &c. It would

would have been an impudence not to be pardon'd had you only ſaid *I fear*, or *I ſuſpect* this: But ſure there is not any Chriſtian, except Mr. *Bagſhaw* whoſe Religion would allow him to ſay, I 'hope his Lordſhip thinks his Book un-'anſwerable: that is in effect, I hope in 'God that his Lordſhip is both an Athe-'iſtical Hypocrite, profeſſing a Religion 'contrary to his conſcience, and with-'all that his Hypocriſie, againſt the na-'ture of that ſin, is ſenceleſly void of all 'worldly pretentions, ſince he counter-'feits a Religion that he knowes is rui-'nous to his fortunes. Is this your *Theological vertue* of *Hope*? Truly it becomes you well: Your *Faith*, *Hope* and *Charity* I ſee are all of a piece.

6. It may be you knew ſome Great Men that for ſome ends you could permit to ſtrain their conſciences ſo far as to profeſs a Religion that themſelves are able to confute. But ſure they will be no loſers by it: whatever becomes of ther ſouls, care ſhall be taken that their worldly Eſtate ſhall thrive by it: They will declare for a Sect where money abounds, and where power and Offices may be ſhared: That is, of all Religions in *England* they will take heed of the *Catholick*.

7. Indeed

7. Indeed if you underſtood what *Catholick Religion* is, you would never ſay ſo much, as *I ſuſpect*, &c. and if you knew what *Chriſtian Religion* is you would never have ſaid *I hope* ſuch an abominable, ſo unreaſonable a thing. In your Sect I conceive ſuch an *Hypocriſie* may be practiſed at a cheaper rate. But in Catholick Religion no Man can commit that ſin alone: it muſt neceſſarily be attended with moſt horrible ſacriledge and a ſolemn profanation of two *Sacraments*, *Pennance* and the *Holy Euchariſt*. Therefore I hope that you have been bold to bely your ſelf when you ſaid, *I hope his Lordſhip thinks his Book unanſwerable*. I have a better opinion of you, then you deſire I ſhould.

Fiat Lux Epiſt. Dedicat.

8. As for the Author of *Fiat Lux* complained of by you to your Honourable Patron in the Epiſtle Dedicatory, where you lay to his charge *Blaſphemies that you* (good man) tremble to mention: If you had ſincerely related thoſe paſſages, and were they conſidered not as ſtanding alone, but with the dependance on what is delivered before, they will be ſo far from deſerving to be called Blaſphemies, that no ſober charitable Reader will deny them to be ſimple un-

unſtrain'd Truths. And if you think good to reply to theſe papers I here undertake to juſtifie thoſe paſſages in the proper true ſence that the Author apparently meant them. Which that it is no hard matter to do I will ſhew you preſently: His firſt paſſage related by you is this: *In my judgment* (ſaith he) *Chriſt our Lord hath no leſs ſhewn his Divinity and power in the Pope, then in himſelf. And all things conſidered, I may truly ſay, that Chriſt in the Pope and Church is more miraculous, then in his own perſon.* My reaſon to demonſtrate the truth of this (which is the Authors too (is this, becauſe the preſervation of the Church in Unity and Truth under the Government of ſupream Paſtours, without interruption for ſixteen hundred years and more amongſt ſo many tryals and oppoſitions, is a greater effect of a Divine power in Chriſt, then he ſhew'd in prolonging his own perſonal life for about thirty three years.

9. And as to the ſecond paſſage, *viz.* 'That the firſt great Fundamental of 'Chriſtian Religion, which is the truth 'and Divinity of Chriſt, had it not 'been for the Pope, had failed long a-'go in the World. So that I may truly ſay,

'ſay, that Chriſt is the Popes God: 'For if the Pope had not been, or had 'not been ſo vigilant a Paſtor as he is, 'Chriſt had not been taken now for any 'ſuch perſon as he is believed this day. Conſult your books, and the whole *Series of Eccleſiaſtical Story* will inform you that the *Pope* by means of *Councels* of the *Weſtern Church* aſſembled by his Authority was he alone that inſtrumentally deſtroy'd *Arianiſme* and other *Hereſies* denying the *Divinity of Chriſt*, which for ſome ages had in a manner poyſon'd all the *Eaſt*.

10. And laſtly without much boaſting I may with him conclude. 'This I may 'boldly ſay, and am aſſured of, that if 'the Pope be not an unerring Guide 'in affairs of Religion, that way I 'mean that I have ſhewn him in all a-'ges to have exerciſed his Guidance [by General Councils,] all is loſt. For this is no other then what with all Catholicks I have aſſerted and will poſitively 'juſtifie, that the authority of the 'Church in her ſupream Tribunals is 'the only aſſured means of preſerving 'the Church in Unity, as being an Au-'thority from which no Appeals muſt 'be admitted, that is, being Infallible.

Theſe

Theſe therefore, you ſee, are no ſuch Blaſphemies as to put you into a fit of trembling.

11. I do now expect, *Sir*, unleſs God inſpire more charity into your heart, that you will make loud complaints of the preſumption of your Roman Catholick adverſary, for daring to defend his Religion againſt your evident miſtakes, and the cauſe of all his profeſſion from the trayterous imputation of a *Dependence on a forreign authority*, moſt unjuſtly by you laid to their charge: like the ancient Gladiatour, you will accuſe us for avoyding your blows and thruſts, and becauſe we do not *recipere totum gladium*. But this Confidence is the effect of our Innocence only, which as the Scripture ſays, *Gives the boldneſſe of a lyon*. Nay, it is for your ſake, if you pleaſe; however it is for our Countreys ſake, that we beg no more innocent blood may be laid to its charge. But if it muſt ſtill be ſpilt, we had rather you ſhould be our Executioners, than any other. We give Almighty God, and the Parliament moſt humble thanks, that we have been permitted to wipe off the ſcandal of Infidelity from our Religion: This we triumph in. Hereafter if we ſuffer, we call

God

God to witneſs, and the whole Kingdom (I mean Engliſh Proteſtants) that it will be purely our Conſcience, our Religion, our love of Peace and Unity that we ſuffer for; for all manner of ſecurity we have, and ever will give of being faithfull, quiet, good Subjects: all Oaths expreſſing only our obligation to Fidelity, or acknowledgment of the Kings temporal Supreamacy we will take. Does it not become then ſuch Sufferers to be confident? Does it not become ſuch lovers of their Countrey to wiſh that no more guilt may lye upon it? True it is, we look upon your party as our Murderers, you give us up into their hands, you kill us with their ſwords. They are inclin'd to mercy, being ſatisfyed of our Innocency: but you threaten to ſet the Kingdom on fire, with your crying out *Popery*, if they ſpare us. We do not expect from his Majeſty, that for our ſakes (though his moſt loyal Subjects) he ſhould take upon himſelf the envy that you would raiſe againſt him. We beſeech him he would not: indeed he ought not to do it, conſidering the miſchief that may follow, is publick, and threatning the whole Kingdom. But the generality of Proteſtants, me thinks, have little

reaſon

reaſon to fear your clamours, when they extend mercy to innocent perſons. And therefore thoſe that by their Offices have an influence upon our Lawes, and are able to abate the ſharpneſs of them, yea have thought fit to take it into conſideration, if they, either out of complyance, or fear of You, forbear to do what Civil Juſtice, and much more, Chriſtian Charity, requires, they muſt not expect that God will hold them innocent: It will be a great mercy if he puniſheth them in this world, either in their eſtates perſons or families.

12. You know the Goſpel Story: I would to God You would make better uſe of it: The Jewiſh Prieſts and Phariſees accuſed our Saviour of ſeditious doctrine: and for that delivered him into the hands of the Romans. What did they lay to his charge? *Art thou a King?* ſaid *Pilate*, that was his charge: He aſſumes (ſaid they) a power contrary to *Cæſars*. Our Saviour acknowledges that he was a King: that he challenged a Supremacy of power: and that he came to conſtitute a new Kingdom upon earth: but it was a Kingdom not of this world: it was a power purely ſpiritual, ſo far from being prejudicial to

Cæſar,

Cæsar, that one of the fundamentall Lawes of this spiritual Kingdom was, *That whatsoever belonged to Cæsar should be given to him*: not one dram of Civil authority should be taken from him. The Romans were satisfied with his answer: *Pilate* protested him innocent. But all little purpose, for the Pharisees make clamours, they stir the people to sedition; they threaten *Pilate*: and the Text sayes, the clamours of the Pharisees and people so wholly prevailed, that our Saviour was *delivered up unto their will, to do unto him even what they pleased*. All that *Pilate* durst to do was to *wash his hands*, and proclaim the violence used upon him: but however he judged him to death, and the Romans crucified him. Now not any man will acquit *Pilate*, though a greater damnation be due to the Pharisees. *Pilates* crime was heynous, but it was humane, he would fain have done justice, but he feared a sedition, he had not the courage to suffer for Justice. But the Pharisees crime was Diabolical, and as they behaved themselves by crying out, *His blood be on us and our Children*, it became unpardonable: both the temporal and eternal destruction of the whole nation was the

reward

reward of it. But now consider who these Priests and Pharisees were that accused our Saviour of seditious Doctrine against *Cæsar*. They were the only Enemies that *Cæsar* had in the whole Nation: *Josephus* will tell us that the principles of their Sect were treason and Rebellion: They only of all the Jews refused an Oath of Allegiance. If our Saviour would have incited his followers to cast off *Cæsars* yoke, they would have joyned with him, and have made him either their King or Protector. They had attempted several insurrections against *Cæsar*, and within a few years after put the whole State into an open bloody Rebellion, which ended in their utter destruction. Yet such power had these mens malicious suggestions as to make our Saviour be condemned as a Traytour: His Disciples therefore must not think to be bettter used then their Master, I mean by Pharisees.

13. I suppose Mr. *Bagshaw*, here is enough said to your Stating of that *great Question of Infallibility*, as you have stated it: And more then You will think enough, to Your cruelty against Roman Catholicks. If you have any suspition that we have not expressed

our mindes clearly and ſatisfactorily enough; Upon any exceptions You will pleaſe to make, more ſhall be ſaid. And as touching what hath been here delivered about diſowning a ſorreign power prejudicial to the State, do not read it as the aſſertion of one ſingle Roman Catholick: But be aſſured that if ever theſe papers be offered to Your eyes to be read, You will read that which has been approved, and will be juſtifyed by many Worthy Perſons of the ſame Religion, perſons of Learning, Vertue and Authority, who therefore can know, and will be anſwerable for the conformable judgments of far greater numbers that depend on their Direction reſpectively.

14. My deſire now is, that you would write no more againſt any Catholick Truth, or Chriſtian peace. But if You cannot for Your life hold, then I would, as a friend, adviſe you to get before hand a right notion and underſtanding of the ſubject you would write upon: and however, that You would forbear laying falſe crimes to the charge of Your brethren: The condition of Roman Catholicks is ſad enough

enough: And truly it is moſt unhandſome for thoſe that are in a State of Uniformity with them, to add to their ſufferings. To conclude, if you think me worthy to be your Adverſary in a Pen-quarrell, let us not diſpute about things in which You have no skill, or that will not be profitable, but rather wound bleſſed Chriſtian Charity. And if you will permit me to propoſe a ſubject in which you and your party are believed to have much intereſt, and which if well debated, would bring much good to thouſands of ſouls in theſe Kingdomes, my deſire is it may be this Problem or Queſtion (which I told you has been taken into conſideration in *France*, *viz.*) *Whether Chriſtian Subjects may by their Religion be allowed to defend by Armes againſt their Soveraign and lawful Authority their Opinions and Doctrines, in caſe theſe be perſecuted by them. For my own part I make choice of the Negative.* And now I reſigne you to the mercy of Mr. *L'Eſtrange.*

FINIS.